



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 1, 2014

No. 64

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, through Whom we see who we are and what we can become, thank You for giving us another day.

Send Your spirit upon the Members of this people's House to encourage them in their official tasks. Be with them and with all who labor here to serve this great Nation and its people.

Assure them that, whatever their responsibilities, You provide the grace to enable them to be faithful in their duties and the wisdom to be conscious of their obligations and fulfill them with integrity.

Remind us all of the dignity of work and teach us to use our talents and ability in ways that are honorable and just and are of benefit to those we serve.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.  
Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. NORTON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### GENTRY FIRE DEPARTMENT 100TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. WOMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in celebration of the Gentry Arkansas Fire Department's 100th birthday.

Gentry, Arkansas, is home to over 3,000 of my constituents; and for the past 100 years, the Gentry Fire Department has been steadfastly committed to their safety and well-being, as well as the safety of thousands more who reside in the surrounding areas of Benton County.

From its humble beginnings in 1914 to the purchase of its first firetruck in the 1940s, the Gentry Fire Department and firefighters have worked tirelessly for its citizens, placing themselves in great danger to protect the lives and property of others.

We rest easy knowing the department will continue to do so for the next century, and I join the residents of Gentry to express my profound gratitude.

Thank you to the Gentry firefighters, past and present, for 100 years of selfless service to the Pioneer community. I wish you a very happy 100th birthday.

### FULL EMPLOYMENT

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, the bottom line is we need bold visions to achieve full employment.

We know only too well that we have had unprecedented periods of high unemployment. We know that we have

about 50 million people, 13 million who are children, living below poverty in the greatest country in the world. We know we must expand economic opportunity to have a strong middle class, who are the backbone of this great country. We know that getting every American working will add to not only our tax base, but also reduce the deficit and debt and eliminate poverty.

So the question is, Madam Speaker, why aren't we doing it? Where are the visionaries? Where is the President's American Jobs Act of 2013 or the 21st Century Full Employment and Training Act? Where are they?

Madam Speaker, let's bring them to the floor.

### CUBAN JOURNALIST JULIET MICHELENA DIAZ

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the case of Juliet Michelena Diaz, an independent Afro-Cuban journalist who last month was unjustly detained by Castro's thugs simply for photographing the brutality of the state security forces of Fidel Castro in Havana.

The detention of this young journalist is not just an example of the regime's efforts to silence those who are critical of its actions, but it also shows how ruthless the Castro brothers continue to be in their policy of repressing independent voices and violating human rights.

There is no independent press in Cuba and many journalists are afraid to speak out against the dictatorship for fear of incarceration. That is why it is so important to support the free flow of information on the island so that the Cuban people can exchange ideas to promote democratic principles and the rule of law.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3367

### DECRIMINALIZING MARIJUANA LAWS

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, 18 States and the District of Columbia have rapidly decriminalized marijuana laws, making them subject only to fines. They did so for various reasons. None of those reasons were more solid or important than the Council's decision to decriminalize D.C.'s marijuana laws.

African Americans in the District of Columbia and Whites use marijuana at the same rate, but Blacks have an arrest record for possession eight times that of Whites. That's discrimination.

It is the same thing when Chairman JOHN MICA of the Government Operations Subcommittee of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee decides to hold a hearing on D.C.'s marijuana decriminalization law but on no others. Two prior hearings have looked at marijuana decriminalization. None has called local public officials.

Be on notice. The District of Columbia insists that it not be treated any differently from the 18 States that have decriminalized marijuana and the States who have legalized it.

### VETERANS FAIR ECONOMIC TOWN HALL

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, last week, I had the pleasure of holding a veterans fair economic town hall and several general town halls across my district. Throughout the conversations I had with my constituents, I heard a growing concern about the increasing government intrusiveness, whether it is in the doctor's office, the classroom, or the economy.

House Republicans understand that our constituents want government to work efficiently. We have offered real solutions that will grow good-paying jobs and expand opportunity for all.

In fact, we have already passed over 200 bills that will start helping people today but unfortunately are still collecting dust on Senator HARRY REID's desk. This includes bills that would lower health care costs and return choice back to patients, as well as expand domestic energy production to both create jobs and lower costs for consumers.

It is time, Madam Speaker, for the Senate to join us in advancing real solutions. It is time to make life work better for all Americans.

### HONORING HAROLD CORBIN

(Mr. MEADOWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor Mr. Harold Corbin

and thank him for his service to the 11th Congressional District. This last Saturday marked 50 years of continued service to this great district. It was the first district meeting that he had missed.

Mr. Corbin is a lifelong resident of Franklin, North Carolina, which is a testament to his commitment to our community; and from 1980 to 1989, Mr. Corbin served as the Republican chairman of the 11th Congressional District. As chairman, Mr. Corbin made important contributions that have had a lasting impact on western North Carolina.

In 1981, his activism led to the election of the former Representative Bill Hendon, who was the first Republican Congressman to represent the 11th District in over 100 years.

From 1982 to 2002, Mr. Corbin served as the chairman of the Macon County Board of Commissioners. His leadership and inspiration to his son led his son to get involved in politics. He now holds that same position. It is both of them that have set a tremendous example for our Nation.

I will close with this. All of us in Washington can learn a lesson from Mr. Corbin, who has long said that, once elected, Representatives serving constituents ought to leave their politics at the door and truly serve the citizens.

### TVA'S WATTS BAR NUCLEAR FACILITY

(Mr. DESJARLAIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share my findings from last week's tour of TVA's Watts Bar Nuclear facility located in Tennessee's Fourth District in Rhea County.

The Watts Bar facility is constructing a second nuclear unit, which will be completed late next year. It will be the 21st century's first new reactor to go online, doubling the facility's capacity and then creating reliable energy for nearly 1.3 million homes and businesses.

This project has contributed significantly to the local economy by providing more than 3,300 high-paying jobs. TVA makes safety and security its top priority. During the construction of Unit 2, the workers have achieved a milestone of 22.8 million work-hours without a lost-time incident.

I would like to extend a special thanks to TVA's senior vice president of operations and construction, Mike Skaggs, and his team for making my visit so educational and productive.

Madam Speaker, it is imperative that we continue to support the safe, affordable, and reliable energy that nuclear provides in order to attract industry and create jobs.

### LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on consideration of H.R. 4487, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 557 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4487.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0912

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4487) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, thank you for the recognition, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 4487, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015, provides \$3.3 billion for the operations of the legislative branch, excluding Senate items. The recommendation is the equivalent to the fiscal year 2014 level and a decrease of \$122.5 million, or 3.7 percent, from the requested level.

Conforming with the longstanding practice under which each body of Congress determines its own housekeeping requirements and the other concurs without intervention, funds for the Senate are not included in the bill as reported by the committee.

Through seven hearings and meetings with agency heads, the committee listened to all who presented their respective concerns and budget requests. It was necessary to make some critical decisions and prioritize programs, and we did this in a bipartisan and transparent manner.

We are presenting to the House today a bill that is fiscally responsible and maintains current operations for the Legislative Branch agencies.

The bill includes \$1.2 billion for the operations of the House. This is equivalent to the fiscal year 2014 enacted

level and \$20 million below the request. It is worthy to note that the funding provided for Member's Representational Allowances and Committees provides for the current operations, and I do not anticipate further reductions in the coming year. The bill also includes the Members' pay freeze for fiscal year 2015.

□ 0915

With this bill, total funding for the House of Representatives is 14 percent below fiscal year 2010.

The bill includes \$348 million for the Capitol Police. This is \$9.5 million above the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and \$77 million less than the requested level. This will support 1,775 sworn officers and 370 civilian positions. A slight increase above last year is provided to ensure the Capitol Police maintain current operations and ensure mission-essential training.

Knowing that access to the House office buildings is of critical concern to Members, we directed that the Chief of Police develop an action plan that will make sure public access to our buildings is easily accessible during heightened periods of visitation. The implementation of this plan is in the early stages, and we will continue to monitor the budgetary impacts to the Capitol Police.

The bill includes \$45.7 million for the Congressional Budget Office. This is at the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and \$378,000 below the requested level.

The bill includes \$488.6 million for the Architect of the Capitol, excluding Senate items. This is a decrease of \$40.5 million from the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and \$79 million below the requested level.

Within the recommended level, the committee continues its prioritization of projects that promote the safety and public health of workers and occupants, decrease the deferred maintenance backlog, and invest to achieve future energy savings.

The committee recognizes the continuing challenge of preserving and maintaining our infrastructure and prioritizing critical projects in the current budgetary environment. It is important to note that \$21 million is recommended for the final phase of dome restoration, a very high priority of this committee.

In addition, we are continuing the 5-year practice of including funds for the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund, a fund established by Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ when she was chair of this subcommittee in anticipation of the renovation of the historic Cannon House Office Building.

Might I say, it is one of the really tremendous contributions that my friend and colleague has made, and I hope it stays inside of our operating procedure for many years to come. It was a wise decision.

Also included is \$16 million for the lease cost of a portion of the Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. Federal Office Building in preparation of the Cannon renewal project.

The bill includes \$595 million for the operations of the Library of Congress. This is an increase of \$16 million above the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and \$1.9 million above the requested level. The amount will allow the Library to continue at current operations.

Established by Congress in 1800, the Library of Congress is one of the largest libraries in the world, with a collection of more than 130 million print, audio, and video items in 460 languages. It is imperative adequate funding is provided to maintain acquisitions, preservation, the administration of U.S. copyright laws by the U.S. Copyright Office for research and analysis of policy issues for the Congress by the Congressional Research Service, and the administration of a national program to provide reading material to the blind and physically handicapped.

The bill before you accomplishes all of that.

It is important to note \$5.5 million of the funding is provided for the Deacidification Program, which is \$1 million over the Library's request. And \$8.2 million is for the Teaching with Primary Sources Program, at \$1 million over the request, to be used for competitive opportunities for developing online interactive and apps for classroom use on Congress and civic participation.

It is \$1.2 million above the request for the Copyright Office to reduce the claims and processing time for copyright registrations and to conduct business analyses for the process engineering of the documentation recordation function.

The bill includes \$122.6 million for the Government Printing Office. This is an increase of \$3.3 million above the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and \$6.3 million below the requested level. Funds have been included for continuation of development and infrastructure costs associated with the Federal digital system and the system replacement for upgrading the extensible markup language.

The bill includes \$519.6 million for the Government Accountability Office. This is an increase of \$14.2 million

above the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and \$5.5 million below the requested level. Language is included to establish a Center for Audit Excellence to build global institutional auditing capacity and promote good governance. This center is to be operated on a fee-based basis.

Finally, the bill includes \$3.42 million for the Open World Leadership Trust Fund. This is \$2.58 million below the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and \$4.58 million below the requested level.

As a sign of support for Ukraine, the committee has reduced the program by 43 percent. This represents the program's percentage of participants from Russia. It is important to stress that Open World's program does not just focus on work with Russia. Ukraine has the next largest group of participants, closely followed by other nations in the surrounding region. Therefore, we encourage the center to do more in Ukraine and with other participating countries in the surrounding region.

I would like to thank my good friend, the ranking member, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for her role throughout the process. We have worked well together in a bipartisan manner. It has truly been a team effort.

Also, I extend my appreciation to all members of the subcommittee in their efforts in helping bring this measure to the floor. I also want to thank the truly excellent staff that has nursed me through this.

Let me just add, parenthetically, that we had a pretty unusual situation in that, because of some early retirements and the loss of our dear friend, Bill Young, we had a lot of reshuffling to do on our committee. On our side, that meant we only had one carryover member, and that was the vice chairman, Mr. HARRIS from Maryland, who was indispensable and extraordinarily helpful to the rest of us.

Again, without a capable staff and without, frankly, a wonderful working partner in my ranking member, we would have had a much more difficult time. Frankly, I don't think anybody in this institution knows this bill and this process better than Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. She has been my friend. I was once on her committee as a very junior member when she chaired it, and I learned a lot from her then. I learned a lot more from her this time.

I look forward to the debate, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL 2015 (H.R. 4487)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
TITLE I - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
Payment to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress.....	174	---	---	-174	---
Salaries and Expenses					
House Leadership Offices					
Office of the Speaker.....	6,645	6,778	6,645	---	-133
Office of the Majority Floor Leader.....	2,180	2,224	2,180	---	-44
Office of the Minority Floor Leader.....	7,114	7,257	7,114	---	-143
Office of the Majority Whip.....	1,887	1,924	1,887	---	-37
Office of the Minority Whip.....	1,460	1,489	1,460	---	-29
Republican Conference.....	1,505	1,536	1,505	---	-31
Democratic Caucus.....	1,487	1,517	1,487	---	-30
Subtotal, House Leadership Offices.....	22,278	22,725	22,278	---	-447
Members' Representational Allowances Including Members' Clerk Hire, Official Expenses of Members, and Official Mail					
Expenses.....	554,318	565,404	554,318	---	-11,086
Committee Employees					
Standing Committees, Special and Select.....	123,903	126,335	123,903	---	-2,432
Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations).....	23,271	23,736	23,271	---	-465
Subtotal, Committee employees.....	147,174	150,071	147,174	---	-2,897
Salaries, Officers and Employees					
Office of the Clerk.....	24,009	24,639	24,009	---	-630
Office of the Sergeant at Arms.....	14,777	12,058	11,927	-2,850	-131
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.....	113,100	116,163	113,100	---	-3,063
Office of the Inspector General.....	4,742	4,742	4,742	---	---
Office of General Counsel.....	1,341	1,353	1,341	---	-12
Office of the Parliamentarian.....	1,952	1,971	1,952	---	-19
Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House.....	3,088	4,114	4,088	+1,000	-26
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House.....	8,353	8,893	8,893	+540	---
Office of Interparliamentary Affairs.....	814	814	814	---	---
Other authorized employees.....	479	479	479	---	---
Subtotal, Salaries, officers and employees.....	172,655	175,226	171,345	-1,310	-3,881
Allowances and Expenses					
Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims.....	3,503	4,153	4,153	+650	---
Official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House.....	190	190	190	---	---
Government contributions.....	258,081	258,081	256,636	-1,445	-1,445
Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery.....	16,217	16,217	16,217	---	---
Transition activities.....	1,631	3,737	3,737	+2,106	---
Wounded Warrior program.....	2,500	2,500	2,500	---	---
Office of Congressional Ethics.....	1,467	1,485	1,467	---	-18
Miscellaneous items.....	720	720	720	---	---
Subtotal, Allowances and expenses.....	284,309	287,083	285,620	+1,311	-1,463
Total, House of Representatives.....	1,180,908	1,200,509	1,180,735	-173	-19,774
=====					

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL 2015 (H.R. 4487)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
JOINT ITEMS					
Joint Economic Committee.....	4,203	4,270	4,203	---	-67
Joint Committee on Taxation.....	10,004	10,149	10,004	---	-145
Office of the Attending Physician					
Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances.....	3,400	3,371	3,371	-29	---
Office of Congressional Accessibility Services.....	1,387	1,405	1,387	---	-18
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Joint items.....	18,994	19,195	18,965	-29	-230
CAPITOL POLICE					
Salaries.....	279,000	291,403	286,500	+7,500	-4,903
General expenses.....	59,459	64,260	61,459	+2,000	-2,801
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Capitol Police.....	338,459	355,663	347,959	+9,500	-7,704
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,868	4,020	3,959	+91	-61
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses.....	45,700	46,078	45,700	---	-378
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
General administration.....	90,277	96,433	91,555	+1,278	-4,878
Capitol building.....	61,376	57,545	53,126	-8,250	-4,419
Capitol grounds.....	13,860	14,366	11,993	-1,867	-2,373
House of Representatives buildings:					
House office buildings.....	71,622	108,934	71,622	---	-37,312
House Historic buildings revitalization fund.....	70,000	70,000	70,000	---	---
Capitol Power Plant.....	125,678	103,990	102,152	-23,526	-1,838
Offsetting collections.....	-9,000	-9,000	-9,000	---	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Subtotal, Capitol Power Plant.....	116,678	94,990	93,152	-23,526	-1,838
Library buildings and grounds.....	53,391	62,756	41,733	-11,658	-21,023
Capitol police buildings, grounds and security.....	19,348	25,605	19,486	+138	-6,119
Botanic garden.....	11,856	15,686	15,023	+3,167	-663
Capitol Visitor Center:					
CVC Operations.....	20,632	21,095	20,875	+243	-220
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Architect of the Capitol.....	529,040	567,410	488,565	-40,475	-78,845
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Salaries and expenses.....	412,052	420,852	424,057	+12,005	+3,205
Authority to spend receipts.....	-6,350	-6,350	-6,350	---	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	405,702	414,502	417,707	+12,005	+3,205
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses.....	51,624	53,068	54,303	+2,679	+1,235
Authority to spend receipts.....	-33,444	-33,582	-33,582	-138	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Subtotal, Copyright Office.....	18,180	19,486	20,721	+2,541	+1,235
Congressional Research Service, Salaries and expenses.....	105,350	108,382	106,095	+745	-2,287
Books for the blind and physically handicapped					
Salaries and expenses.....	49,750	50,696	50,429	+679	-267
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Library of Congress.....	578,982	593,066	594,952	+15,970	+1,886

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL 2015 (H.R. 4487)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE					
Congressional printing and binding.....	79,736	85,400	79,736	---	-5,664
Office of Superintendent of Documents, Salaries and expenses.....	31,500	32,171	31,500	---	-671
Government Printing Office Revolving Fund.....	8,064	11,348	11,348	+3,284	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Government Printing Office.....	119,300	128,919	122,584	+3,284	-6,335
GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses.....	537,751	548,866	543,372	+5,621	-5,494
Offsetting collections.....	-32,368	-23,750	-23,750	+8,618	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Government Accountability Office.....	505,383	525,116	519,622	+14,239	-5,494
OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TRUST FUND					
Payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund.....	6,000	8,000	3,420	-2,580	-4,580
JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT					
Stennis Center for Public Service.....	430	430	430	---	---
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Scorekeeping adjustment (CBO estimate).....	-1,000	---	-1,000	---	-1,000
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Grand total (Discretionary and Mandatory).....	3,326,064	3,448,406	3,325,891	-173	-122,515
Discretionary.....	(3,325,890)	(3,448,406)	(3,325,891)	(+1)	(-122,515)
Mandatory.....	(174)	---	---	(-174)	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
RECAPITULATION					
House of Representatives.....	1,180,908	1,200,509	1,180,735	-173	-19,774
Joint Items.....	18,994	19,195	18,965	-29	-230
Capitol Police.....	338,459	355,663	347,959	+9,500	-7,704
Office of Compliance.....	3,868	4,020	3,959	+91	-61
Congressional Budget Office.....	45,700	46,078	45,700	---	-378
Architect of the Capitol.....	529,040	567,410	488,565	-40,475	-78,845
Library of Congress.....	578,982	593,066	594,952	+15,970	+1,886
Government Printing Office.....	119,300	128,919	122,584	+3,284	-6,335
Government Accountability Office.....	505,383	525,116	519,622	+14,239	-5,494
Open World Leadership Center.....	6,000	8,000	3,420	-2,580	-4,580
Stennis Center for Public Service.....	430	430	430	---	---
Other appropriations.....	-1,000	---	-1,000	---	-1,000
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Grand total (Discretionary and Mandatory).....	3,326,064	3,448,406	3,325,891	-173	-122,515
Discretionary.....	(3,325,890)	(3,448,406)	(3,325,891)	(+1)	(-122,515)
Mandatory.....	(174)	---	---	(-174)	---

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and my ranking member, NITA LOWEY, for the commitment that they made to regular order, which is why we have our second appropriations bill on the House floor by May 1. It is my hope that we can stay true to this commitment throughout the remainder of this year.

I also want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, TOM COLE, who I really couldn't say enough good things about what an incredible partner he has been. We really have—and I will say that several times throughout my remarks—worked cooperatively, collaboratively, and I think the finest compliment that I can pay another Member is that they are an institutionalist—someone who has incredible respect for those that came before us and the history and tradition and all that has led to us being the finest democratic institution in the entire world.

We are stewards of the Capitol complex in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, and the chairman really has most definitely recognized that and honored it.

The budget deal struck during the shutdown last year gave us 2 years of discretionary caps so that the Appropriations Committee can now get on with the business of funding important government programs.

There are many opinions about how these resources should be allocated amongst programs, but that is a legitimate debate, rather than the alternative, which we saw during the government shutdown last October.

For my part, I am pleased with and supportive of the bill that my good friend Chairman COLE has put forward today, done within the funding constraints that the Legislative Branch Subcommittee had to operate under. We worked collaboratively, and, as always, it was a pleasure to work with him.

The bill provides level funding, and, unfortunately, the constrained allocation has ensured that there is no increase for Member and committee offices. Personal office budgets have been cut by 16 percent since 2010, while committees have been cut by 14 percent over the same period. When considered through a long lens, those cuts are even more damaging.

The Congressional Research Service reported in August 2010 that House committee staff levels declined 28 percent between 1977 and 2009. The recent cuts have only served to compound the decline in staffing levels highlighted by CRS.

There is no question that these cuts will continue to have a harmful effect on this institution—on our ability to retain the best and brightest and to serve our constituents most effectively. We have gone through some difficult economic times, there is no question, but as we emerge, we need to con-

sider how continuing these stark funding levels affects our ability to compete with the executive branch and the Senate for the best talent. When a Senator can offer to double the salary of a legislative assistant working for a House Member, there is an imbalance that we ignore in the House, at our peril.

I want to thank Chairman COLE also for the focus placed on the Copyright Office in this bill. In the FY 2015 budget hearing with the Library of Congress last month, we heard about the need to bring the copyright system into the 21st century with business practices that provide for more interaction and improvement with the copyright community.

This bill starts that process by investing \$1.5 million in much-needed IT improvements for the Copyright Office. The bill also carves out \$750,000 to deal with the copyright backlog, which grew larger over the last few years as they lost staff due to tightening budgets.

As the authorizing committees review our Nation's copyright laws, these additional investments will ensure that the Copyright Office can meet immediate needs as well as prepare for new ways to do business.

During the Capitol Police hearing and during subcommittee markup we heard from Members on both sides of the aisle about the impact door closures have had on our constituents and staff. This is why we included report language requesting a report on how the Capitol Police can accomplish door openings without increasing overtime. We have now received what I can only hope is a draft report from the Capitol Police that details the opening of only two doors for 2½ hours each day.

The committee has been clear that access is one of the Capitol Police's top priorities, and the current plan does not reflect that priority. My expectation, which I know is shared by many Members, is that now that the Capitol Police have been provided essentially full relief from the sequester, multiple doors throughout the House should be staffed and opened for the entire workday.

Reducing overtime costs through door closures is unacceptable. Forcing our constituents, staff, and people trying to do business at the Capitol into long lines is inefficient and stressful for the public and the officers.

I will be asking the Chief to go back to the drawing board on this report.

The bill continues funding for the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund at \$70 million, for which I thank the chairman. Since the estimate to rehabilitate the Cannon House Office Building, which is 100 years old, has come in at a staggering \$753 million, investing a little at a time in the trust fund is the most responsible way to fund this and other major projects.

The bill also includes funding for the final phase of the Capitol dome project

at \$21.2 million. The funding provided this year will address the interior walls, columns, and coffered ceiling that have sustained significant water damage and paint delamination.

The public will soon see the skyline of our Nation's Capital changed with scaffolding on the Capitol dome that will begin to go up at the end of this month, using funds from previous years. The total pricetag to restore the dome will be around \$106 million after this year's funding is provided.

This bill also directs the Library of Congress to continue their 30-year program to deacidify books and provides an additional \$1 million to keep that program on track.

Also of note, the bill cuts the Open World Leadership Center by 43 percent to \$3.4 million. The Stennis Center Leadership program is funded at \$430,000 after finally—and thankfully—providing the committee with a budget justification for the first time, on time.

I congratulate Chairman COLE on writing a balanced bill with a few targeted investments. Even though I wish we could do more—and I know he does too—to invest in our staff, I know that the chairman had many competing priorities, including our vast infrastructure needs.

Chairman COLE, again, I have truly enjoyed working with you in this role, and I appreciate the accommodations made for the minority in this bill. Working with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle has been an absolute pleasure. It was a collaborative and cooperative effort. We are truly, I think, the example for the entire Congress on what collegiality means. The process in putting this bill together was really a team effort.

Chairman COLE understands that this may be the smallest appropriations bill, but one that is essential to his colleagues and the job they do to serve their constituents.

In conclusion, Madam Chairman, I want to thank the committee staff as well who has helped to craft this bill and assisted in a bipartisan manner: Shalanda Young; Liz Dawson, who continues to amaze us every single fiscal year; Chuck Turner; and Jenny Panone.

Also, we could not have done this without our personal staff: Maria Bowie and Sean Murphy, with Chairman COLE's personal office; and Ian Rayder from my office.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from the great State of Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

□ 0930

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, I seek the opportunity to have a colloquy with Chairman COLE. I thank them for their work, the chairman and his staff, the work they have put into the legislation they are bringing before us this morning.

As a member of the Congressional Yellow Pages Caucus, I strongly believe that if an activity is available from a private company that can be found in the Yellow Pages, it should either not be a responsibility carried out by the Federal Government or, at the very least, performed by a private firm under contract with the Federal Government.

It is in that spirit that Congress needs to begin the process of leveling the playing field between the Government Printing Office, the GPO, and private industry. Nowhere is the overreach of the GPO and its statutory authority, found in title 44 of the United States Code, more egregious than in the area of secure Federal credentials.

Consider this: title 44 was codified in 1968. Secure credentials, produced by the private sector, first appeared about 30 years later and then became pervasive after 9/11.

I can't imagine that policymakers in the sixties could have ever envisioned title 44 expanding beyond the printing of copies of the Federal Register or the Declaration of Independence to cover credentials, let alone secure credentials, as the kind of printed products the GPO has traditionally produced.

The GPO's statutory monopoly on this issue has been challenged by numerous reports by the GAO and groups such as the National Performance Review.

Secure credentials are a world apart from the products that GPO has traditionally produced and should not be subject to title 44.

I hope that we can take steps to define a clear role for the GPO, create competition, and ensure that the private secure credentials industry and companies like MorphoTrust in Tennessee can perform these functions that the GPO has no business in carrying out.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds just to note that the Government Printing Office has been in business, doing the work, beyond the scope of printing the Federal Register, for more than 100 years.

It is also important to note that they specifically contract with the private sector to print a myriad of documents, and they are not the only institution that prints documents.

Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, I want to thank my good friend from Florida for her leadership on this bill, as well as my very good friend from Oklahoma, who has done a terrific job as chair. Both of you take your responsibilities extremely seriously, as you should.

This is the bill that funds the institution itself, and you have both resisted efforts to demean this institution and to suggest that traditions and resources that have been available to this institution in the past are not necessary.

Both of you understand, because you are institutionalists and revere this institution, there are a lot of things that go on in this institution that play an important role toward serving the American public.

I do regret the fact that there was an amendment that was not made in order. I didn't expect that this amendment would have passed, but it was an issue that needed to be discussed on the House floor because it sets a precedent, what I believe is a very dangerous precedent.

This year, this bill freezes congressional compensation. It is the sixth year in a row that we have frozen our own salaries, but by putting it in this bill, I have been part of this institution long enough to know that, once you do that, there is a very high likelihood that neither political party, no matter who has the majority, is going to be willing to ever take it out; and so it will acquire an aspect of permanence.

So what I suggested is that we have a \$25 a day housing stipend, just for those Members that live at least 50 miles from Washington, D.C. I am 10 miles. It wouldn't affect me. None of the other things that are available to Members, small as they might be, affect us either.

Obviously, we can't change our own pay. We can't raise it. So it wouldn't apply till the next term. I am retiring, but I will never lose my love for this institution, and that is why I am doing it.

It just happens that we will be in session 112 days, times 25, that would come, not coincidentally, to exactly what the salary increase would have been had we not frozen it.

The reason for doing this is that, since I was first elected to the Congress, in inflation-adjusted dollars, the compensation to Members has gone down by one-fifth. In the meantime, the cost of rental housing in D.C. has increased substantially.

Rental housing is going up as fast or faster than most other metropolitan areas of the country. In fact, the median cost per month, it is \$2,250; per year, it is \$27,000.

The problem is that if we continue to freeze the compensation to Members, my fear is—and Mr. COLE, I know, is going to provide a different perspective, but I think the fear is legitimate—that what we will wind up with is a composition of the Congress composed primarily of Members who don't need the pay, who are independently wealthy, who can blithely send the check back and take credit for it because they don't need it. In fact, more than half the Congress today, I understand, are millionaires.

On the other hand, you may have some who figure, well, I will serve one, two, three terms and then go into the private sector and use that experience, albeit limited, to enrich themselves. A lot of people do it. I am not being particularly critical, but I want to raise the issue as to what that means for the Congress itself, for this institution.

I don't think this is the right thing to do, Madam Chairman. We need people who represent those folks who barely make it, who have to pay a mortgage, who have student loans to pay, who have kids to raise. They represent the majority in this country, and it is so difficult for Members to maintain two residences.

I wouldn't have expected us to lose an opportunity for self-flagellation, but I do think we should have raised this issue.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very good friend.

I think I have made my point. We need to be as representative of the country as possible. For all our failings, for all our deficiencies, for all our needs, our struggles, we need to be able to empathize with people who have the same kind of financial constraints.

I know people think this is a lot of money, but if you are not going to show respect to yourself as an institution, you can't expect the public to show you much respect either.

We are the board of directors of the largest economic entity in the world. We deserve that respect. We ought to stand up for ourselves, defend this Congress—because what we do is defensible—and show that we merit adequate compensation, so we can be wholly representative of this great American public.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend and I have had a number of opportunities to talk about this issue. We talked about it in committee, we talked about it yesterday in discussion on the rule, and we are talking about it today because I think he wants to make his point, and I think he is using every opportunity to make his point.

Quite frankly, it is a point that needs to be made and a point that deserves to be heard. One of the things I will miss about my friend a lot is his tenacity when he has got something that he thinks is important and his willingness to go through a little heat and a little criticism, which I know he has received over this, to make that point. That is a very valuable characteristic in any Member.

I don't think we are in immediate danger, the kind of future and the kind of House that my friend describes, but I do think, if we were to continue this course indefinitely, we would be.

Now, again, as I mentioned yesterday in our exchange, remember, a lot of people who come here for a short time aren't coming here to cash out on anything. They are coming here because they believe in the limited time of public service, and quite often, that is a pretty popular point of view in their districts. So I cast no aspersions on somebody that comes for 6 or 8 years, and that is their choice.



In my State, that is exactly what Senator TOM COBURN did in this body for 6 years and what he has done in the United States Senate. I know that is a sincere opinion as to what he thinks the appropriate thing is, and quite frankly, he has certainly never cast himself out and hung around Washington, D.C. I think that is true of many, many Members.

As my friend makes a good point about the character of the body and where we may be headed if we do the wrong things over time, I also think we are in a really critical point in our country where we are having to make a lot of difficult decisions.

We have made a lot of difficult decisions on this committee, made a lot of cuts that we didn't want to make because we thought the budget deficit was too high, and we needed to ask people to make some painful reductions.

I think if you are going to ask people to make painful reductions you have got to lead by example, and I think that is actually what both sides have tried to do.

Again, I know when my friends were in the majority, we didn't always get cost of living increases and those sorts of things either. They had inherited a difficult situation. They were making tough choices, and they were trying to lead by example.

I think that is exactly what this majority has continued to do, and so maintaining your personal credibility and your institutional responsibility, while you are arriving at and administering difficult decisions, I think, is a very important characteristic. So that is what we have tried to do in this bill.

Again, I appreciate my friend for making his point because I think, over time, we could change the character of the institution if we are not careful. I don't think that is an immediate concern, but it is one we ought to reflect on as we move forward.

Again, I thank him for his service, and I thank him for his persistence and tenacity.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, at this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), our distinguished ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairman COLE and Ranking Member DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for their hard work on this bill. It really was a bipartisan effort, and I do think you have produced a good bill.

Today, we consider the smallest of the appropriations bills which funds the operations of our Nation's legislative branch.

Without Senate items, the bill is \$3.326 billion, the same as 2014. While I am pleased with the overall funding level, it was my hope that, after years of cuts to Member Representational Al-

lowances, or the MRAs, we might provide a modest increase this year.

Member offices have sustained \$106 million in cuts since 2010. While some reduction was appropriate, those cuts have severely strained the House's ability to serve the American people, due to fewer staff for constituent casework, the inability to effectively communicate with our constituents, and fewer district offices.

Unless we return to sensible funding levels, we cannot stave off the further erosion of expertise, morale, and comity in this great institution.

This bill funds the Open World Leadership program at \$3.42 million, a reduction of \$2.58 million. Instead of reducing funds equivalent to the amount for exchanges with Russians, we should shift the funds to support a larger presence in Ukraine and other countries fostering democratic principles, as suggested in the committee report.

□ 0945

Madam Chair, with that said, I congratulate, once again, the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for putting forth a balanced bill and urge its support.

Mr. COLE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), our distinguished ranking member of the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me.

Madam Chair, I just wanted to say a few words in support of this year's Legislative Branch Appropriations Act. I have been honored to serve on this subcommittee for the last 4 years. I am the only member, in fact, to have served on the subcommittee for the last two Congresses.

It may have the smallest budget of the 12 appropriations bills, but it is vital to the work we do here in Congress and our ability to serve our constituents. From paying our staffs, to maintaining a digital and printed record of our work, to getting cost estimates of our legislative proposals, the legislative branch is so important to the proper functioning of our system of government.

It is especially gratifying that this year's bill reverses some of the draconian cuts from the legislative branch which have occurred over the last few years. I said last year that including these cuts would have been like cutting off our nose to spite our face. After all, agencies under the bill's jurisdiction, like the Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office, help Congress to identify potential savings and efficiencies throughout the government.

Or consider the Architect of the Capitol, which is responsible for the maintenance, operation, development, and preservation of the United States Cap-

itol. Two years ago, the House couldn't find the necessary funds to complete the restoration of one of the most vital symbols of our democracy, the Capitol dome. I am pleased this year that the legislation includes \$21.2 million for the last phase of the Capitol dome restoration.

Other agencies in the bill receive much-needed investments, including the Library of Congress, the United States Capitol Police, and the Government Printing Office.

I would like to commend the outstanding bipartisan work of Chairman COLE and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ in crafting this year's bill. Chairman COLE has done a yeoman's job stepping in at the last moment following the retirement of our colleague Rodney Alexander and shepherding this measure for the full House Appropriations Committee this morning.

I am also greatly appreciative of Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, whose institutional knowledge of the agencies in this measure is really unmatched.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I yield the gentleman from Georgia an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Both Chairman COLE and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ were greatly aided by their excellent staff: Liz Dawson, Chuck Turner, Jenny Panone, and Shalanda Young.

I look forward to supporting the bill and doing all that I can to ensure its swift passage by the full House of Representatives.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was tempted to actually yield my friend from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) additional time, he was being so kind to all of us on both sides of the aisle. But I genuinely want to thank my friend who is a very valuable member of our committee and, again, someone who is always thoughtful, always helpful, and always works in a bipartisan manner. You saw it on this floor yesterday when he and Chairman CULBERSON delivered their bill in a very bipartisan and a very professional manner. He does the same thing on our committee. So I just wanted to thank my friend.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, at this time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just wanted to once again thank my friend, my working partner in this, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. She, in this area, is an absolute expert without peer in this House, which has been enormously helpful to me.

Again, I want to thank the members of the committee. I want to thank all of the staff, frankly, from both sides of the aisle, all of the personnel offices. They have just been absolutely first-rate.

As I observed, I think, in one of our committee meetings, if the current chairman of the Democratic National Committee and the former chief of staff of the Republican National Committee can work this well together, then surely all things are possible in this universe.

It has been a pleasure to work with my friend. I look forward to continuing that collaboration as we go forward.

With that, Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 4487—the Fiscal Year 2015 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act.

For our government to truly remain “of the people, and by the people” the House of Representatives must be a place that is open and transparent to all. From ensuring constituents can meet with their elected representatives to guaranteeing open access to the legislative business of Congress, the Legislative Branch must be accessible to the public. We also have a responsibility to ensure the safety and security of the U.S. Capitol complex for all who work here and all who visit.

Therefore, as a Member of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, one of my priorities has been to provide appropriate oversight regarding the security of the U.S. Capitol complex, including Members, staff, and visitors. I have met personally with House Sergeant of Arms Paul Irving and will continue to follow closely any developments relating to security concerns. I greatly appreciate Mr. Irving and our professional team of Capitol Police officers for the tireless work they put in to protect us and all who visit these hallowed halls.

Madam Chair, this bill adequately provides for the needs of the House Sergeant of Arms and the Capitol Police to ensure the necessary steps can be taken to maintain and strengthen security procedures for the entire Capitol complex.

Recent events have shown that even the most secure buildings in our country are still susceptible to security lapses. That is why it is more important than ever to remain vigilant in our efforts to ensure we are secure.

As I continue to serve on this Subcommittee, it is my responsibility to ask questions, find solutions, and help enact policies to keep members, staff, and guests as safe as reasonably possible.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise today to highlight what I believe are anti-competitive practices at the Government Printing Office, or GPO.

As its name implies, the GPO was set up to do government printing. Title 44 of the United States Code states that “all printing, binding, and blank-book work for Congress, the Executive Office, the Judiciary, other than the Supreme Court of the United States . . . shall be done at the Government Printing Office.” GPO’s mission statement is to “produce, protect, preserve, and distribute the official publications and information products of the Federal Government.” Somehow, GPO has interpreted this to mean that “printing” includes the creation of secure federal credentials.

Madam Chair, the production of secure federal credentials cannot be reasonably classified as printing. The production of these credentials involves electronic storage capability,

anti-counterfeiting technologies, and specialized manufacturing techniques. Furthermore, Title 44 was codified in 1968—secure credentials were not created until 30 years later. It is hard to believe that lawmakers in the 1960’s could have envisioned the technical know-how that goes into making these credentials, much less classified the production as printing.

The real problem, however, lies with GPO asserting its authority to make these products while crowding out private sector competition. The federal government has successfully contracted out production of secure credentials to the private sector for years. The private sector competes for these contracts, ensuring that we end up with the best product for the best price. More disturbingly, I have heard reports indicating that GPO has a dedicated sales staff, and sends other staffers on sales calls to promote its secure credentials capabilities to federal agencies. GPO’s attempt to fill this space inhibits competition by encouraging the federal government to insource at the expense of innovations in the private sector. I believe we need to level the playing field.

By highlighting this issue, I hope to trigger a discussion that will define a clear role for the GPO today, but also to ensure that the private secure credentials industry, the acknowledged leaders in this field, will have a chance to compete for government contracts.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4487

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, namely:*

TITLE I—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, \$1,180,736,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, \$22,278,891, including: Office of the Speaker, \$6,645,417, including \$25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, \$2,180,048, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, \$7,114,471, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, \$1,886,632, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, \$1,459,639, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Republican Conference, \$1,505,426; Democratic Caucus, \$1,487,258: *Provided*, That such amount for salaries and expenses shall remain available from January 3, 2015 until January 2, 2016.

MEMBERS’ REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES

INCLUDING MEMBERS’ CLERK HIRE, OFFICIAL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS, AND OFFICIAL MAIL

For Members’ representational allowances, including Members’ clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, \$554,317,732.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, \$123,903,173: *Provided*, That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2016, except that \$2,300,000 of such amount shall remain available until expended for committee room upgrading.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, \$23,271,004, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed: *Provided*, That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2016.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, \$171,344,864, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including the positions of the Chaplain and the Historian, and including not more than \$25,000 for official representative and reception expenses, of which not more than \$20,000 is for the Family Room and not more than \$2,000 is for the Office of the Chaplain, \$24,009,473; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages and the Office of Emergency Management, and including not more than \$3,000 for official representation and reception expenses, \$11,926,729 of which \$4,344,000 shall remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer including not more than \$3,000 for official representation and reception expenses, \$113,100,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, \$4,741,809; for salaries and expenses of the Office of General Counsel, \$1,340,987; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian, \$2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, and not more than \$1,000 for official representation and reception expenses, \$1,952,249; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, \$4,087,587, of which \$1,000,000 shall remain available until expended for the completion of the House Modernization Initiative; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, \$8,892,975, of which \$540,000 shall remain available until expended for the completion of the House Modernization Initiative; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Interparliamentary Affairs, \$814,069; for other authorized employees, \$478,986.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, \$285,620,336, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, \$4,152,789; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, \$190,486; Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, \$256,635,776, to remain available until March 31, 2016; Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery, \$16,217,008 of which \$5,000,000 shall remain available until expended; transition activities for new members and staff, \$3,737,000, to remain available until expended; Wounded Warrior Program \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended; Office of Congressional Ethics, \$1,467,030; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of

House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, \$720,247.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. (a) **REQUIRING AMOUNTS REMAINING IN MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES TO BE USED FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION OR TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEBT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amounts appropriated under this Act for “HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SALARIES AND EXPENSES—MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES” shall be available only for fiscal year 2015. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for fiscal year 2015 shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction (or, if there is no Federal budget deficit after all such payments have been made, for reducing the Federal debt, in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

(b) **REGULATIONS.**—The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall have authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—As used in this section, the term “Member of the House of Representatives” means a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

#### DELIVERY OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

SEC. 102. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of a bill, joint resolution, or resolution to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) unless the Member requests a copy.

#### DELIVERY OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SEC. 103. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of any version of the Congressional Record to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

#### LIMITATION ON AMOUNT AVAILABLE TO LEASE VEHICLES

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives to make any payments from any Members' Representational Allowance for the leasing of a vehicle, excluding mobile district offices, in an aggregate amount that exceeds \$1,000 for the vehicle in any month.

#### LIMITATION ON PRINTED COPIES OF U.S. CODE TO HOUSE

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide an aggregate number of more than 50 printed copies of any edition of the United States Code to all offices of the House of Representatives.

#### JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

##### JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, \$4,203,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

##### JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, \$10,004,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

For other joint items, as follows:

##### OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including:

(1) an allowance of \$2,175 per month to the Attending Physician;

(2) an allowance of \$1,300 per month to the Senior Medical Officer;

(3) an allowance of \$725 per month each to three medical officers while on duty in the Office of the Attending Physician;

(4) an allowance of \$725 per month to 2 assistants and \$580 per month each not to exceed 11 assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistants; and

(5) \$2,486,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, \$3,371,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

##### OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ACCESSIBILITY SERVICES

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, \$1,387,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

##### CAPITOL POLICE

##### SALARIES

For salaries of employees of the Capitol Police, including overtime, hazardous duty pay, and Government contributions for health, retirement, social security, professional liability insurance, and other applicable employee benefits, \$286,500,000 of which overtime shall not exceed \$23,425,000 unless the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate are notified, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee.

##### GENERAL EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, security equipment and installation, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, personal and professional services, the employee assistance program, the awards program, postage, communication services, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and not more than \$5,000 to be expended on the certification of the Chief of the Capitol Police in connection with official representation and reception expenses, \$61,459,000, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 2015 shall be paid by the Secretary of Homeland Security from funds available to the Department of Homeland Security.

##### OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), \$3,959,000, of which \$450,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That not more than \$500 may be expended on the certification of the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance in connection with official representation and reception expenses.

##### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary for operation of the Congressional Budget Office, including not more than \$6,000 to be expended on the certification of the Director of

the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, \$45,700,000.

##### ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

##### GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries for the Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law; for surveys and studies in connection with activities under the care of the Architect of the Capitol; for all necessary expenses for the general and administrative support of the operations under the Architect of the Capitol including the Botanic Garden; electrical substations of the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol; including furnishings and office equipment; including not more than \$5,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; for purchase or exchange, maintenance, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle, \$91,555,000.

##### CAPITOL BUILDING

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol, \$53,126,000, of which \$28,817,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019.

##### CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, \$11,993,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019.

##### HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, \$71,622,000, of which \$7,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019.

In addition, for a payment to the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund, \$70,000,000, to remain available until expended.

##### CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, the Union Station complex, the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, \$93,152,000, of which \$8,686,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That not more than \$9,000,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 2015.

##### LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, \$41,733,000, of which \$16,542,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019.

##### CAPITOL POLICE BUILDINGS, GROUNDS, AND SECURITY

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of buildings, grounds and security enhancements of the

United States Capitol Police, wherever located, the Alternate Computer Facility, and AOC security operations, \$19,486,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019.

#### BOTANIC GARDEN

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, \$15,022,946, of which \$5,122,946 shall remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, the Architect of the Capitol may obligate and expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance, care and operation of the National Garden established under section 307E of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (2 U.S.C. 2146), upon vouchers approved by the Architect of the Capitol or a duly authorized designee.

#### CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

For all necessary expenses for the operation of the Capitol Visitor Center, \$20,875,000.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

##### SCRIMS

SEC. 1001. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for scrims containing photographs of building facades during restoration or construction projects performed by the Architect of the Capitol.

#### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Library's catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library; activities under the Civil Rights History Project Act of 2009; preparation and distribution of catalog records and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, \$424,057,000, of which not more than \$6,000,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2015, and shall remain available until expended, under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150) and not more than \$350,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2015 and shall remain available until expended for the development and maintenance of an international legal information database and activities related thereto: *Provided*, That the Library of Congress may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under the Act of June 28, 1902, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than \$6,350,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not more than \$12,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, \$8,231,000 shall remain available until expended for the digital collections and educational curricula program.

#### COPYRIGHT OFFICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, \$54,303,000, of which not more

than \$27,971,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2015 under section 708(d) of title 17, United States Code: *Provided*, That the Copyright Office may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under such section, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That not more than \$5,611,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2015 under sections 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), 803(e), 1005, and 1316 of such title: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than \$33,582,000: *Provided further*, That not more than \$100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an "International Copyright Institute" in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not more than \$6,500 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute and for copyright delegations, visitors, and seminars: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provision of chapter 8 of title 17, United States Code, any amounts made available under this heading which are attributable to royalty fees and payments received by the Copyright Office pursuant to sections 111, 119, and chapter 10 of such title may be used for the costs incurred in the administration of the Copyright Royalty Judges program, with the exception of the costs of salaries and benefits for the Copyright Royalty Judges and staff under section 802(e).

#### CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, \$106,095,000: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

#### BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), \$50,429,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, \$650,000 shall be available to contract to provide newspapers to blind and physically handicapped residents at no cost to the individual.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

#### REIMBURSABLE AND REVOLVING FUND ACTIVITIES

SEC. 1101. (a) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2015, the obligational authority of the Library of Congress for the activities described in subsection (b) may not exceed \$203,058,000.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—The activities referred to in subsection (a) are reimbursable and revolving fund activities that are funded from sources other than appropriations to the Library in appropriations Acts for the legislative branch.

#### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; expenses necessary for preparing the semimonthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (section 902 of title 44, United States Code); printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, \$79,736,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under section 906 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the 2-year limitation under section 718 of title 44, United States Code, none of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act or any other Act for printing and binding and related services provided to Congress under chapter 7 of title 44, United States Code, may be expended to print a document, report, or publication after the 27-month period beginning on the date that such document, report, or publication is authorized by Congress to be printed, unless Congress reauthorizes such printing in accordance with section 718 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Printing Office revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding sections 901, 902, and 906 of title 44, United States Code, this appropriation may be used to prepare indexes to the Congressional Record on only a monthly and session basis.

#### OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, \$31,500,000: *Provided*, That amounts of not more than \$2,000,000 from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional serial sets and other related publications for fiscal years 2013 and 2014 to depository and other designated libraries: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Printing Office revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

#### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

For payment to the Government Printing Office Revolving Fund, \$11,348,000, to remain available until expended, for information technology development and facilities repair: *Provided*, That the Government Printing Office is hereby authorized to make such

expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Printing Office Revolving Fund: *Provided further*, That not more than \$7,500 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of not more than 12 passenger motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the headings "Office of Superintendent of Documents" and "Salaries and Expenses" may not be used for contracted security services at the Government Printing Office's passport facility in the District of Columbia.

#### GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Government Accountability Office, including not more than \$12,500 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with section 3324 of title 31, United States Code; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), (6), and (8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), (6), and (8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries, \$519,622,000: *Provided*, That, in addition, \$23,750,000 of payments received under sections 782, 3521, and 9105 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of either Forum's costs as determined by the respective Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants: *Provided further*, That payments hereunder to the Forum may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

##### CENTER FOR AUDIT EXCELLENCE

SEC. 1201. (a) CENTER FOR AUDIT EXCELLENCE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Chapter 7 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subchapter:

#### "SUBCHAPTER VII—CENTER FOR AUDIT EXCELLENCE

##### "§ 791. Center for audit excellence

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Comptroller General shall establish, maintain, and operate a center within the Government Accountability Office to be known as the 'Center for Audit Excellence' (hereafter in this subchapter referred to as the 'Center').

"(b) PURPOSE AND ACTIVITIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Center shall build institutional auditing capacity and promote good governance by providing affordable, relevant, and high-quality training, technical assistance, and products and services to qualified personnel and entities of governments (including the Federal government, State and local governments, tribal governments, and governments of foreign nations), international organizations, and other private organizations.

"(2) DETERMINATION OF QUALIFIED PERSONNEL AND ENTITIES.—Personnel and entities shall be considered qualified for purposes of receiving training, technical assistance, and products or services from the Center under paragraph (1) in accordance with such criteria as the Comptroller General may establish and publish.

"(c) FEES.—

"(1) PERMITTING CHARGING OF FEES.—The Comptroller General may establish, charge, and collect fees (on a reimbursable or advance basis) for the training, technical assistance, and products and services provided by the Center under this subchapter.

"(2) DEPOSIT INTO SEPARATE ACCOUNT.—The Comptroller General shall deposit all fees collected under paragraph (1) into the Center for Audit Excellence Account established under section 792.

"(d) GIFTS OF PROPERTY AND SERVICES.—The Comptroller General may accept and use conditional or non-conditional gifts of property (both real and personal) and services (including services of guest lecturers) to support the operation of the Center, except that the Comptroller General may not accept or use such a gift if the Comptroller General determines that the acceptance or use of the gift would compromise or appear to compromise the integrity of the Government Accountability Office.

"(e) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PERSONNEL.—It is the sense of Congress that the Center should be staffed primarily by personnel of the Government Accountability Office who are not otherwise engaged in carrying out other duties of the Office under this chapter, so as to ensure that the operation of the Center will not have a negative impact on the ability of the Office to maintain a consistently high level of service to Congress.

##### "§ 792. Account

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF SEPARATE ACCOUNT.—There is established in the Treasury as a separate account for the Government Accountability Office the 'Center for Audit Excellence Account', which shall consist of the fees deposited by the Comptroller General under section 791(c) and such other amounts as may be appropriated under law.

"(b) USE OF ACCOUNT.—Amounts in the Center for Audit Excellence Account shall be available to the Comptroller General, in amounts specified in appropriations Acts and without fiscal year limitation, to carry out this subchapter.

##### "§ 793. Authorization of Appropriations

"There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subchapter."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 7 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### "SUBCHAPTER VII—CENTER FOR AUDIT EXCELLENCE

"791. Center for Audit Excellence.

"792. Account.

"793. Authorization of appropriations."

(b) APPROVAL OF BUSINESS PLAN.—The Comptroller General may not begin operating the Center for Audit Excellence under subchapter VII of chapter 7 of title 31, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)) until—

(1) the Comptroller General submits a business plan for the Center to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate; and

(2) each such Committee approves the plan.

#### OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TRUST FUND

For a payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund for financing activities of the Open World Leadership Center under section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151), \$3,420,000.

#### JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

For payment to the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund established under section 116 of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1105), \$430,000.

#### TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Administration and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SEC. 202. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond fiscal year 2015 unless expressly so provided in this Act.

SEC. 203. Whenever in this Act any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 (46 Stat. 32 et seq.) is appropriated for or the rate of compensation or designation of any office or position appropriated for is different from that specifically established by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation in this Act shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions in this Act for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 204. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued under existing law.

SEC. 205. Amounts available for administrative expenses of any legislative branch entity which participates in the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council (LBFMC) established by charter on March 26, 1996, shall be available to finance an appropriate share of LBFMC costs as determined by the LBFMC, except that the total LBFMC costs to be shared among all participating legislative branch entities (in such allocations among the entities as the entities may determine) may not exceed \$2,000.

SEC. 206. The Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the District of Columbia, is authorized to maintain and improve the

landscape features, excluding streets, in the irregular shaped grassy areas bounded by Washington Avenue, SW on the northeast, Second Street, SW on the west, Square 582 on the south, and the beginning of the I-395 tunnel on the southeast.

SEC. 207. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

SEC. 208. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available to the Architect of the Capitol in this Act may be used to eliminate or restrict guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by employees and interns of offices of Members of Congress and other offices of the House of Representatives and Senate.

(b) At the direction of the Capitol Police Board, or at the direction of the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of the Capitol Police Board, guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by employees and interns described in subsection (a) may be suspended temporarily or otherwise subject to restriction for security or related reasons to the same extent as guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by the Architect of the Capitol.

SEC. 209. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no adjustment shall be made under section 610(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31) (relating to cost of living adjustments for Members of Congress) during fiscal year 2015.

#### SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 210. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, excluding Senate items, exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

This Act may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2015".

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113-426. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113-426.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, beginning line 23, strike "in an aggregate amount that exceeds \$1,000 for the vehicle in any month" and insert "and excluding short-term vehicle rentals in an aggregate amount that does not exceed \$1,000 for the vehicle in any month".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Chairman, my amendment is simple. It would end the practice of Members leasing vehicles on the taxpayers' dime. I am just not convinced that this is a necessary use of taxpayer money, and neither are the constituents that I represent.

We are asking agencies throughout the Federal Government to use their funding carefully and to cut out unnecessary, nice-to-have things. We ought to apply the same standard to ourselves, and in many ways we have done an excellent job of doing that.

Funding for the House of Representatives has been cut since the Republicans took the majority by over 14 percent. We have cut our own MRAs and committee funds. We have frozen our own pay.

Unfortunately, the vehicle lease program isn't consistent in that effort. That is not to say that some Members who lease vehicles aren't doing it responsibly. They are, and they have good reason. Unfortunately, I think the line of what is appropriate in terms of leasing vehicles has been blurred by others. Members of Congress driving around the Capitol in luxury vehicles financed by the taxpayers that they represent isn't exactly the image we want to portray to the American people, especially when many Americans are struggling just to get by.

The vehicle lease program in its current form is simply out of touch with the economic reality of what our American brothers and sisters face. Therefore, until we can ensure that all Members of Congress are using this program responsibly, I believe we ought to halt it entirely.

The Senate, to their credit, in one of the few times that I agree with the Senate—and I don't say that often—already has barred its Members from leasing vehicles with public money; and, frankly, I think it is time that we do the same.

To be clear, my amendment is straightforward. It says that the CAO may not make any payments from any Member's Representational Allowance for the leasing of a vehicle. My amendment excludes short-term vehicle rentals and mobile district offices, as those are often necessary resources used in serving our constituents. But having basically a personal car entirely paid for by taxpayers should no longer be allowed.

I urge adoption of my amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. I want to begin by thanking my friend. We serve together on the Rules Committee. It is very seldom that I would disagree with my friend, who not only has a distinguished record here, but a distinguished record in law enforcement.

And let me make it clear. I am quite content to let the body work its will on this matter. I appreciate my friend ac-

tually bringing it forward. I think it is important to discuss.

I had not really thought about this a great deal until I saw my friend's amendment. I don't lease a vehicle through my office at all. Although we have discussed it and looked at it, it just never seemed to be appropriate or make sense for us. We do have 63 Members, however, who do do this practice. The average cost of the vehicle is \$589.

Now, I can't tell you that I have taken a survey of all 63, but I have talked to a few—just sort of tell me what your reasoning is—and the responses are pretty diverse. But you could break it into two or three categories.

First, some of them cover exceptionally large districts, and they find this the most cost-effective way to actually cover it, I mean, even to the point of saying, as one Member said:

I go through rough terrain to reach remote areas. I need a vehicle that, frankly, is quite a bit more robust than members of my staff have or that I even have personally, sometimes, to reach some of my constituents.

I thought that was a pretty impressive reason.

Second, others, again, just find it much more cost-effective than actually paying and reimbursing for mileage. But I think the core thing here is to trust—actually trust—the Member to make the decision.

I think an important point here is to note that we are not going to save any money, really. This comes out of the Member's Representational Allowance as it is, so there is not a real savings here. And it is all publicly disclosed, so Members take some considerable risk if they do this. They have to be able to explain it to their constituents.

At the end of the day, I just simply don't want to micromanage individual Members in how they spend the money which we allot them through this bill.

And with that, I understand my good friend would like to say some things, so I will yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the ranking member.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I also rise in opposition to my Florida colleague's amendment, which seeks to dictate to other Members how to spend their office budgets. It is important to note that I also do not lease a vehicle.

The bill already sets a limit on what Members can spend on vehicle leases to ensure that costs are appropriately controlled. The Nugent amendment would go further and prevent long-term vehicle leases unless they are classified as mobile district offices.

The problem with the gentleman from Florida's amendment is the same as we have had with other similar amendments in the past that have sought to restrict or eliminate Members' use of funds for their office budgets.

We have Members that represent entire States or very large geographic



areas. Removing transportation options for Members trying to effectively represent their constituents forces a one-size-fits-all approach to serving our congressional districts, and we know that is not reasonable nor does it make sense.

The House makes statements of disbursements available to the public so that our constituents can judge us on the purchases that we make. Each Member has to answer to his or her constituents if they spend inappropriately or if they make purchases that are at odds with the sensibilities of those that sent the Member to office. We don't need to dictate to each other how we can most effectively do our jobs.

With that, Madam Chair, I urge the defeat of this well-intentioned but misguided amendment.

Mr. COLE. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Chair, I do appreciate the comments of more senior Members of this House. I, obviously, have been here 3 years, and I do appreciate their comments.

But I will go back to this. Think about this. The Senate, each Senator represents their whole State. They gave up that privilege a while back because it didn't make sense. But think about this. Today, Members of Congress can lease Lexuses, BMWs, Infinities, Acuras, Mercedes, which all fall within the guidelines, and not all do that. But does that send a message to our folks back home that this is the right way to do it? Because that MRA that was discussed, this also covers all of the wear and tear on the car, it covers the fuel. There is no expense that is spared with regards to covering that, versus the mileage reimbursement, if I used my own car, which I do.

That is not to try to diminish or hurt any Member. It really is, though, bringing us into compliance with the same thing that the Senate has done. It is about reasonable usage of the dollars the taxpayers give us.

Once again I will tell you that I agree with most of what my good friends have said, but I disagree on this one. I truly believe it is time for this House to move forward and limit itself in regards to these types of acquisitions and purchases.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

□ 1000

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113-426.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 11, line 10, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

Page 12, line 16, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, I rise today because many Americans think Congress has unchecked power. They think we know how to make laws but don't know how to follow them. They think of us not as the House of Representatives but as the House of Hypocrites. I have spent a lot of time here on the floor speaking about sexual harassment and the epidemic of rape in the military and on college campuses. It is just as important that we bring the same scrutiny to our own House.

The American people expect us to conduct ourselves in a manner befitting the responsibilities and duties that we hold as Members of Congress—not as if we are freshmen in a frat house. While they are the exception, not the rule, it is an embarrassment to this institution that some Members have "sexted" teenage pages on the floor. It is unacceptable that others have groped and inappropriately touched their staff members. This behavior is illegal and unacceptable in the private sector, and it is illegal and unacceptable here.

This is not a Democratic issue, and this is not a Republican issue. This is a House issue. Just recall former Congressman Bob Filner. He pled guilty to charges of felony false imprisonment for sexually harassing a former aide in the San Diego's mayor's office. When Mr. Filner was ranking member on the Veterans' Affairs Committee in the House, he allegedly sexually harassed several female members of the Armed Forces who were rape survivors. But none of the women ever said a word while Mr. Filner was still here—not one.

If you work for a private company in my home State in California, it is likely you have had several hours of sexual harassment training to identify and prevent sexual harassment in the workplace because it is the law. It is also the law in California that State legislators and their staff participate in a mandatory sexual harassment training every year. But that is not the case here in the House.

In fact, congressional Office of Compliance staff say that when new Members go through their 3-day training, they are mostly counseling empty seats by the end of day 3.

Sexual harassment training is already mandatory for the executive branch agencies, and it has proven to

result in a significant reduction in the number of discrimination, harassment, and retaliation claims. But this training for Congress is only voluntary. The congressional Office of Compliance provides sexual harassment training to offices, but it is not typically requested until after an office reports an incident.

It is time we take advantage of the valuable training the office provides. My staff and I actually have taken this 1½ hour training, and as much as I know about sexual harassment, I learned additional things during that training.

Madam Chairwoman, my amendment is simple. It appropriates \$500,000 in additional funds to the Office of Compliance to be used to enhance sexual harassment training programs by implementing a Web-based platform. These funds will also be used for outreach to inform House office employees what their rights are, the various forms sexual harassment takes, and where to go if they experience sexual harassment. It is time to send a new message: that we are here to serve and that we are not above the law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition; although, I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the gentlelady from California's amendment, which would provide an additional \$500,000 to the Office of Compliance. The funding is intended for the office to provide mandatory sexual harassment training for all congressional offices in the House of Representatives.

Surveys find that anywhere from 25 to 31 percent of women in the United States have experienced sexual harassment at work, with the majority of women reporting that the harasser was a direct supervisor or senior to them. Sexual harassment creates counterproductive, hostile, and potentially dangerous working environments, not only threatening the emotional and physical well-being of women, but also women's job performance and security.

There is no reason to think the House of Representatives is immune to this problem. The House of Representatives should not be exempt from providing proper training to identify, prevent, and report sexual harassment, as many private institutions undertake.

Additionally, this type of training is already mandatory for all executive branch agencies. It is time that we follow suit to ensure that the entire Federal Government is setting a model example for safety and respect in the workplace.

To that end, I have cosponsored Representative SPEIER's resolution, which

amends the rules of the House to require that the mandatory annual ethics training offered to Members, officers, and employees of the House include the specific program of training in the prevention and deterrence of sexual harassment in employment.

I urge support of this amendment and thank the gentlelady for her leadership on this issue, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment. When I came to Congress, I was outraged by the behavior of some of my colleagues. In one incident, a woman Member was told to share a seat with a male colleague when there weren't enough chairs at a committee meeting.

While there have certainly been improvements, recent events embarrassing this institution highlight the continued need for training. We cannot allow "Mad Men"-style antics to occur in our offices.

Sexual harassment training will help victims, improve awareness of what is not allowed, and is necessary if we want to be serious about stopping inappropriate acts.

I thank the gentlelady for offering this amendment, and I encourage your support.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. At this time, I would like to yield 30 seconds to Chairman COLE.

Mr. COLE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I just want to thank my friend from California for bringing this amendment. I think it is a truly important amendment and something that we are more than happy to accept, and appreciate her raising the issue very, very much.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We thank the gentleman and appreciate his support.

At this time, I would like to yield the balance of our time in opposition, even though no one is speaking in opposition to this very important amendment, to the gentlelady from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), the chair of the Committee on House Administration.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me time, and I certainly want to thank my colleague from California for offering this very, very important amendment which we are all very supportive of.

This amendment, as has been explained, provides additional funds to the congressional Office of Compliance. This is the agency that really is tasked with making sure that Members of Congress and—very importantly, most importantly—their staff are aware of what their individual rights are and how to protect themselves against sexual harassment in the workplace.

Unfortunately, sometimes it seems like the Members might be protected,

but perhaps their staffs are not as well aware and protected as they need to be. This is certainly not a partisan issue. We have seen incidents over the years of Republicans and of Democrats, both sides of the aisle here.

Actually, Madam Chair, this week I met with senior staff at the OOC. I met with all the board members there. We talked about what kind of additional training might be helpful when we put together our new Members orientation program in the fall, various kinds of things that we can do, and, of course, they needed a little bit more cash to be able to really step up, particularly on the Internet and various things, and do awareness training. So this amendment, I think, is very important.

Certainly, Madam Chair, Congress needs to be held to the highest standards, and, at a minimum, we ought to be held to the same standards that we hold private businesses to out in the marketplace and the workplace.

Every employee that works on this Hill needs to work in an environment that they feel is free from sexual harassment, and if they feel threatened in any way, they need to be able to be sure that they understand their rights and what recourse they have to protect themselves without any fear of retribution. I think Congress needs to be a leader on this issue—a leader—and I certainly feel that by conducting awareness training, that will help stop any unfortunate situation, and if we don't stop it, certainly, then, allowing an individual to protect themselves. That, I think, is an important thing for all of us.

So, again, I thank the gentlelady from California for offering the amendment, and I would urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I also yield back the balance of my time and thank the gentlelady from California for her amendment.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113-426.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 2, after the first dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$3,166,946)".

Page 32, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$3,166,946)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today to speak in favor of my sim-

ple and straightforward amendment. My amendment would reduce funding to the United States Botanic Garden to the levels appropriated in fiscal year 2014. That money would then be transferred to the Spending Reduction Account so that we could take one more step towards reining in Federal spending.

I would be the first to say that I appreciate the Botanic Garden and its beauty. I believe it is a good program, and I am personally interested in botany. But Members of Congress are often faced with difficult choices, especially given our current fiscal crisis. There are programs that are constitutionally mandated, and other programs that are nice but are not constitutionally mandated. This is one program that is nice but cannot be immune from the fiscal pressures facing our government.

While the Botanic Garden is a wonderful attraction, Congress must seek to limit excessive spending in the name of getting our fiscal house in order. No line item can be overlooked in making these assessments and decisions, including our own office budgets, as we have demonstrated.

Madam Chairwoman, so many families are tightening their belts during these trying economic times. Congress must do the same and make cuts where it can.

I am concerned that the Architect of the Capitol has proposed over \$5.1 million in new capital projects at the Botanic Garden this year. Rather than making minor repairs to a few small leaks in the roof, the Architect of the Capitol is proposing to tear down the entire roof and replace it with something called a new vegetative roofing system. At a time of soaring deficits and with the Federal debt in excess of \$17 trillion, such expenditures are especially wasteful, and we shouldn't be wasting precious taxpayer money on a new, state-of-the-art vegetative roofing system.

My proposed amendment is a fair cut. It does not gut the program but merely rolls back the appropriations back to 2014 levels. My amendment still allows for almost \$2 million in new capital projects and repairs to take place in fiscal year 2015.

A note about vegetative roofs. They are usually at least twice the cost to install and require a much higher maintenance cost, and in some cases have unintended consequences by attracting wildlife into urban areas, as an example, geese. I ask each Member to vote in favor of the Gosar amendment.

Madam Chairwoman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment which



seeks to cut over \$3 million from the Architect of the Capitol's Botanic Garden—the people's Botanic Garden.

Now, I understand the gentleman from Arizona is trying to generate headlines by attempting to cut much-needed funding to one of the most beloved destinations in Washington, D.C., our Nation's Capital, but this is not the way to fix our Nation's deficit.

Over 200 years ago, George Washington had a vision for our Capital City to include a botanic garden that would demonstrate and promote the important role plant life plays in our Nation. It may seem trivial, but the Botanic Garden, established in 1820, is one of the oldest botanic gardens in the United States. It is also one of the most visited destinations on the Capitol complex. In fact, I know it is my own children's favorite place to visit when they come to Washington, D.C., and often our first stop.

Our constituents sent us here to do real work and look for real solutions to the deficit, not to try to score cheap political points by attacking important institutions that have already taken a fiscal hit, like the Botanic Garden.

The gentleman says that no line-item or opportunity can be looked over when it comes to reducing our deficit. Yet, I urge the gentleman if he is looking for ways to significantly reduce our deficit, to urge the House Republican leadership to address comprehensive immigration reform, which would result in a \$900 million reduction in the deficit over the next 20 years. Going after a garden isn't the answer.

In fact, I think it is important to note that since President Obama took office, our deficit has been cut by more than 50 percent as a percentage of our GDP.

With that, I urge the Members to defeat this ill-advised amendment.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding. I want to thank my friend too because I know the spirit in which this is brought is to save money and to make some tough decisions, and I share that. It is worth pointing out that we did reduce the Architect's request by \$79 million.

□ 1015

Frankly, we are spending about \$40 million less than we did last year, so it is not as if we have not been serious about this. We did look at this particular area. My friend from Florida made the point that not only is it a well-traveled destination point and very desirable place, but it is a pretty old building, and we really do have serious problems here that we think are potentially health hazards.

We have chunks of the building, 5-15 pounds, that have fallen off from the height of 40 feet, and that is a health hazard; so given the traffic there, given the fact that we have been pretty tough across the board, we thought

this was one of those urgent priorities that needed to be taken care of.

Again, I have no qualms with my friend's motives. I know he is trying to save money. I share that belief. We have made a lot of tough decisions across the board, and it is certainly appropriate for this body to look, and if people can find areas, we are happy with that.

In this case, our judgment as a committee—and certainly my judgment—is that we need to make certain that a facility that is this well used is kept safe and in good repair, so we don't risk liability and risk injury and, frankly, that we do keep open and functioning one of the most beloved institutions of the Capitol complex.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113-426.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 13, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$243,000)".

Page 32, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$243,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, the bill under consideration today is probably the smallest appropriations bill that we see each year, at least in terms of the number of dollars involved.

It funds the operations of the legislative branch—both the operational expenses of the congressional offices and the expenses which occur in protecting and maintaining Capitol grounds.

This bill decreases in several places, and it holds the line on a number of accounts as well. In total, the bill provides funding which is in line with the amount provided just last year. I commend the Appropriations Committee for this. However, there are also a number of increases found within the bill.

Earlier this week, I submitted amendments to the Rules Committee,

all of which were meant to target accounts which received seemingly inexplicable increases. I have been allowed one amendment today, only one, which would decrease funding for the Capitol Visitor Center by \$243,000 and move the same amount to the spending reduction account.

This move would result in the Visitor Center funding being equal to the amount which was appropriated last year, just keeping it at the same level.

The Capitol Visitor Center opened to the public in December of 2008, and according to the Congressional Research Service, it cost more than \$600 million to complete. While the Visitor Center received about \$65 million in private donations, the rest of its cost was borne by taxpayers.

Madam Chairman, it has been less than 10 years since the Visitor Center has opened, at considerable public expense. I think, given our current fiscal state, we can certainly afford to level fund the Visitor Center, hold the line, and use this increase, while just a small one, to help reduce our Federal deficit. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, this amendment cuts the small inflationary increase of \$243,000 provided to the Capitol Visitor Center in this bill. This small increase is needed for the Capitol Visitor Center to keep up with inflation in order to provide the same level of service to our constituents next year as they are providing this year. When is enough enough?

My colleague must not be aware that the Capitol Visitor Center is 7 percent below the funding level that they were in fiscal year 2010. They have already contributed their fair share to deficit reduction.

If my colleague is serious about reducing the national debt and the deficit, then I would suggest that he stop voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act because the recent CBO estimate is that there would be a net increase of \$109 billion to the deficit between 2013 and 2022 if the Affordable Care Act is repealed.

Perhaps he can call on his own leadership to reduce the deficit by \$900 million by taking up and passing comprehensive immigration reform.

When I was chair of this subcommittee, I inherited a fiscal disaster in cost overruns during the construction of the Capitol Visitor Center. We were collaboratively and in a bipartisan way able to bring that project in for a soft landing and slow the hemorrhaging of Federal funds for a project that a Republican majority began.

Now, we recognized that the responsible thing was to ensure that this facility had the tools necessary to succeed, so that our visitors could have an

informative and welcoming space to visit their government and to understand our democracy, so it baffles me that we would see an amendment that goes after the very organization that interacts with our constituents nearly every day.

I want those working in the Capitol Visitor Center to know that we appreciate the work they do. They are essential to the experience our constituents have when visiting our Nation's Capitol. With that, I urge defeat of the amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Madam Chair, first, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I want to thank my friend too because I know he is very serious about looking for places to cut costs. Indeed, later on, there are a number of items that Members have brought to our attention that we will accept. In this case, we don't think it is appropriate.

I do want to thank my friend from Florida. I happened to be on this committee as a junior Member when she did do, I think, an unbelievably good job in working us through what had been a bad process and cost overruns in the Center.

At the end of the day, this is where millions of Americans—this is their portal to the Capitol. It is well run, and it is well managed. I think maintaining access and keeping it safe and keeping it welcoming, if you will, is very important.

So while this is a legitimate question to raise, I agree with my friend and would oppose the amendment.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I didn't realize with this amendment that we were going to get into debate about the unaffordable, uncaring act, so-called ObamaCare. Actually, I have the solution.

We have been promised that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. We have been promised that if you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance. We know both of those are not factual.

We know both of those were known by the President when he made those claims to America, that he knew that they were not factual also. I am just waiting for the President to come out with this claim: if you like your gun, you can keep your gun.

Before getting back to the appropriations process, let me, to just finish up—and that is, I have the solution. It is called the Patient Option Act. It will actually make everybody's health insurance in this country less expensive.

It will provide access to good quality health care for all Americans, and it will save Medicare from going broke. It has been endorsed by the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, as well as FreedomWorks, and it will solve the problems that we all face of an out-of-control health care cost system burden that has been placed on us by a government that has intruded into the health care system itself.

Madam Chairman, this country expects us to make cuts. We are spending money we don't have. We are borrowing 40 cents on every dollar that we spend, and we just have to stop spending money we don't have. We have to restore fiscal sanity to the government. That is what I will continue to do as a Member of Congress, as long as I am here.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, as a breast cancer survivor and one of the 129 million Americans who live in this country with a preexisting condition, I am thankful for the Affordable Care Act and the peace of mind it established on January 1 when, never again, an insurance company in this country could drop us or deny us coverage, the coverage that the gentleman from Georgia has repeatedly voted to take away from millions of Americans.

This amendment would cut the Capitol Visitor Center by \$243,000, when we need to make sure that they have the cost of inflation increase, so they can continue to provide the good service that they provide to our constituents, so we can continue to educate Americans and everyone around the world about the finest democracy in the world.

Madam Chair, I urge Members to vote against this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113-426.

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 7, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$3,420,000)".

Page 32, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$3,420,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Chair, first, I want to commend the work of both Mr. COLE and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ in producing a spending bill that doesn't actually increase spending. It doesn't actually reduce it, but it actually maintains it; and for this institution, I think that is a positive, and I commend you both for doing that.

I think it is important, when we talk a lot about our debt at \$17 trillion—we have deficits at \$1.5 trillion today, down to a little over \$600 billion, I think it is important that this institution lead by example and look to places that we can cut, places that we can be more efficient, when we look at spending on operations here in the House.

When we do that, I think it is important to look at duplicative programs, programs that accomplish the same mission through multiple agencies.

I would submit to this Chamber that one of those is the Open World Leadership Center. This program—its purpose is to engage emerging leaders from post-Soviet countries by exposing them to American cultural institutions. I would argue it has outlived its usefulness.

Listen, it is great that we should engage others from around the world. We should engage their leaders. I think that can help bridge the gap.

The problem with this program is that, since 2000, it has cost the American taxpayer \$150 million; but not only that, we have nearly 90 programs that try to accomplish this very same mission, just to name a few in the State Department: the National Endowment for Democracy, the International Republican Institute, the National Democratic Institute, and USAID, all with this same mission.

So I think this is a space where we can eliminate this program. The mission can still be accomplished with other agencies, and we can move over \$3 million to deficit reduction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chair, I want to thank my friend. Again, I appreciate the spirit in which he approaches this. This is an interesting point of discussion because we actually have Members of both parties who really like this program and think it is very important, and we have Members of both parties that share your point of view. It is not a partisan debate in the least.

I would say that there are a number of both contemporary points and a number of longer-term points that ought to be taken into account.

□ 1030

First, this was originally a \$6 million item. We have cut it by 43 percent aimed at Russia. All the other participants in this program are the very countries that Russia threatens right now; particularly Ukraine, which is the second largest participant. I think it would be a really bad signal for this country to actually cut programs that are supportive of democracy in the areas immediately around Russia and, frankly, I think more or less plays into Mr. Putin's hand.

Beyond that, we have a unique institution, a unique arrangement, and a unique person heading it at the Library

of Congress, Mr. Billington, who is probably the world's most expert on Russian history, culture, and literature. This has been well placed, as long as he has been the librarian, and well used.

So, again, I appreciate my friend's motives, but I would urge the rejection of his amendment.

With that, I would like to yield the remainder of the time that I have to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), my good friend.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, I could not agree more with my good friend from Oklahoma, the chairman of this subcommittee, the idea that my colleague from Wisconsin would suggest that this program has outlived its usefulness when the Russian bear is hungrier than it has been in decades, when Putin seized Crimea and now he is trying to take parts of eastern Ukraine.

Let me explain what this program does. It takes emerging leaders in Russia and Russia's satellite countries, former members of the Soviet Union, who show exceptional talent and interest in speaking for themselves and it brings them over to the United States and puts them in homes and communities where they will learn how our rule of law works, what equal justice under the law means in a truly democratic country. It shows them how to participate in the democratic process. It shows them how we have taken the works of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn and we have implemented them in a country that respects individualism and puts individualism higher than statism. It is a direct threat to communism. It is a direct threat to Mr. Putin. Because if you do this, Mr. Putin can't keep his \$60 billion he has taken from corruption. He can't continue to make his people dependent upon the state. This is disruptive to him. It is a direct threat to him. That is why it is important.

Haven't we done enough for Mr. Putin's interests to cut this program by 43 percent by preventing these young emerging leaders from being able to come over to this country? Do we now have to deny Ukrainian leaders the ability to gain an understanding of what a country that is not corrupt, of what a country that respects individualism, respects democracy, respects equal justice under the law is all about?

That is what this program is all about. We spend half a trillion dollars on our military, and yet programs like this will accomplish more for sustainability of peace among nations by giving an opportunity for people to speak for themselves, to speak out for the rule of law, to speak against corruption. That is what we as a nation want. We don't want to dominate anybody else. We want to be an instrument of our values and our vision. We want to be that beacon of light and hope for other nations. This is one of the ways in which we achieve that objective. A

small amount of money, but an enormously valuable contribution to world peace.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Chairman, with all due respect, to those who may disagree with this amendment—I am seeing some bipartisan agreement; I know I have some bipartisan disagreement with this amendment—but to my colleagues, there are 90 programs that are aimed at accomplishing the very same mission. When do we come forward and say: Listen, let's cut this back; let's cut it back a little bit? The bridge isn't cut off, but we have other programs that are doing the same thing.

Listen, we want to talk about what is going on in Ukraine and want to talk about what is going on in Russia. This program didn't exist in the 1980s. Ronald Reagan didn't have this program to tear down the Soviet Union. He did it with strong leadership. So to come to this institution and say: Listen, the \$3.4 million in this program is going to stop the aggression of Putin, no. Strong leadership will, though. This is about when do we come together as an institution and find programs that are duplicative, programs that we can look and say: This can be scaled back and we can look to one of the other 89 programs to accomplish this same mission.

There is a constituency around every dollar. That is why it is so hard in this town to scale back because everyone will come forward and go: But no, no, no; this dollar is so important. And people come from our communities and go: No, don't cut back.

We are \$1.7 trillion in debt. This is unsustainable. So let's come together and find this program that we can cut and look to the other 89 that can accomplish the same mission, which I think is a noble mission.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HALL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 113-426.

Mr. HALL. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 211. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of the report of disbursements for the operations of the House of Representatives under section 106 of the House of Representatives Administrative Reform Technical Corrections Act (2 U.S.C. 5535) to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. HALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HALL. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank my good friend Chairman COLE and the Appropriations Committee for allowing me to offer this amendment in conjunction with Congressman MCCAUL. My amendment today simply prohibits the Statement of Disbursements of the House from being distributed the old-fashioned way—through print.

A lot of people say I am old-fashioned and I am behind the times, but I have a Facebook account, I tweet, and just this week my congressional Web site was singled out for the Silver Mouse Award, placing it in the top 6 percent of all congressional Web sites for transparency, ease of use, and accessibility of constituent services.

Right now, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House distributes 441 copies of its three-volume Statement of Disbursements to the House at a cost of well over \$300,000 per year. This quarterly public report of all reports and expenditures for U.S. House of Representatives Members, committees, leadership, officers, and offices was more than 2,400 pages long in its last edition. Multiply that by 441, and you have 100,000 pages of printed material, all of which can easily be accessed on the CAO's Web site.

To be clear, my amendment does nothing to prohibit the CAO from making the Statement of Disbursements of the House available online to Members as they currently do. But if I can learn to communicate electronically, I sure don't see why the Federal Government can't do the same thing.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I want to accept this amendment.

You certainly aren't behind the times. You are usually ahead of the curve.

In this case, the gentleman certainly is. I appreciate him pointing out an area where we can save \$300,000. He is precisely right on this. We are more than happy to accept the amendment and, again, very much appreciate our friend for bringing it to the floor and for saving the American taxpayers \$300,000.

Mr. HALL. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. WENSTRUP

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 113-426.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 211. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) a printed copy of the Daily Calendar of the House of Representatives which is prepared by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Chairman, I rise in support today of amendment No. 7.

My amendment is simple. It would eliminate the daily delivery of printed copies of the House Calendar to Member offices.

This multipage paper booklet is currently delivered each legislative day to 441 Representatives' offices. The document in my hand is about 100 pages, meaning that about 44,000 pages are wasted each legislative day, over 5 million pages a year.

The information in these pages is readily available online, and, as required, paper copies will be kept on record. Previously, the House took similar action by ending paper deliveries of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few years ago with no adverse effects.

Let's be honest, Madam Chairman, no one sits and peruses the calendar every day. Most offices accept the delivery, turn 90 degrees, and place it in the recycling bin. Hardly a good use of time or precious paper.

Ending this outdated practice also saves money. We can save hardworking taxpayers nearly \$200,000 a year, according to the Government Printing Office.

Madam Chairman, I want to note that this idea came from one of my staff members, Kate Raulin, who repeatedly recycles these Calendars and grew frustrated at the waste she saw every day. Imagine if every staff member of this body had an idea or an amendment that would save the taxpayers about \$200,000 a year. By my back-of-the-napkin calculations, those savings would easily top over a billion dollars a year.

When I worked in the private sector, we had to be mindful of excess costs and waste. The government must be held to the same standard and should reform outdated policies. We should not remain stuck in the past. If the daily cost of delivery came out of each Member's personal office budget, how many of us would actually pay to get this delivered every day?

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and vote "yea."

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WENSTRUP. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I want to thank my friend for bringing this to the floor. He is precisely right in everything that he says about both the costs

and the functionality of the document in question.

His staff member is to be commended for bringing it to his attention and for you acknowledging her. I think staff people every place are grateful. We are delighted to accept this amendment, delighted to save the money, and, again, appreciate our friend bringing it to our attention, pointing it out, and saving the taxpayers \$200,000.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 113-426.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 211. There is appropriated, for salaries and expenses of the Office of Technology Assessment as authorized by the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (2 U.S.C. 471 et seq.), hereby derived from the amount provided in this Act for the payment to the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund, \$2,500,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 557, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

For 23 years, Congress had an insightful nonpartisan agency aimed at providing Members of Congress and their staff with expert advice on the technological aspects of public policy. It was called the Office of Technology Assessment. From 1972 to 1995, it produced reports on topics that were striking in their relevance even today: computer software security, disposal of chemical weapons, teaching with technology, bioenergy, and many more. OTA was part of Congress, understood the congressional process; it spoke the language of Congress, and it looked at the technological aspects of a large variety of issues and provided clarity where it was needed.

□ 1045

Congress turned out the lights on the OTA in 1995 with the thought that congressional agencies like CRS, GAO, also universities and private industry would fill the void. They have not. In the years since the OTA was defunded, our need for its work has grown only more acute. Too often, we have considered or not considered legislation in ignorance of the technological factors.

That is why I am introducing an amendment to restore some funding to the OTA. My amendment would reallocate to the OTA \$2.5 million appro-

priated for the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund, about 1.4 percent of the surplus in that trust fund. During its 23 years, the OTA produced an amazingly high return on investment, with hundreds of millions of dollars in savings.

A study on Agent Orange helped save the government \$10 million. An OTA report was the source of recommendations for upgrades in the computer system of the Social Security Administration that led to a savings of more than \$300 million. Studies on the synfuels helped save, literally, billions of dollars.

When Congress stopped receiving the OTA's counsel, technological topics didn't become less relevant in the political process; they just became less understood, and scientific thinking lost its foothold on Capitol Hill, with troubling consequences for the ways we legislate on all issues, not just on those that are explicitly scientific.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment in order to give Congress a tool that we desperately need to do the people's work with clarity and reason.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, my friend is, frankly, one of the most thoughtful and best Members of this body. There is no question about that. So, when we discussed this, I took it very seriously because it was my friend's proposal, and I think any other Member in this House would do the same. At the end of the day, I came to a different conclusion for a number of reasons.

First, we are in a very tight budget. We have no increase at all, so funding this initiative means effectively taking money away from someplace else. Second, I looked at the long-term spending pattern of this program in the past. It actually peaked at \$20 million, so I think starting at \$2.5 million is not likely where it will end up over time. Third, quite frankly, I looked at what some of my predecessors in my position had thought, both Republican and Democratic. As my friend knows, obviously, the Democrats had the majority after 1995 for a 4-year period, which was relatively recently, and they looked at this and came to the same decision that was made in '95, and that, I think, we make today, which is that there are other sources of information. The Government Accountability Office, in particular, has developed a capability here, and we think there are other sources of information.

While I don't deny that this has played a useful role in the past, I just believe, given the constrained circumstances that we have today, given the possibility that this will grow, and given what at least to date has been a bipartisan judgment that this is something we didn't need to renew, I, reluctantly, decided not to include this in

the bill. For that reason, I would also oppose the amendment.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), my good friend, the ranking member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman, regretfully, because I know how passionate the gentleman from New Jersey is about this important issue.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this well-intentioned amendment, which seeks to add \$2.5 million to reestablish the Office of Technology Assessment, which did have an important scope of work for Congress during its existence in the 1990s. Unfortunately, the amendment takes the funding from the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund. This fund is critical for the long-term maintenance for such items as the Cannon House Office Building's rehabilitation, which is an ongoing project that has already begun. The fund was established so we could bank resources over several years for the revitalization of our House office buildings and stave off cost overruns that have plagued previous projects.

I have been a supporter of the Office of Technology Assessment dating back to my time as chair of this subcommittee. In fact, in fiscal years 2008–2010, I included \$2.5 million in this bill within the Government Accountability Office for activities similar in scope to the work of OTA's. I also supported an identical amendment offered by Mr. HOLT in fiscal year 2012, as the Cannon project had not yet commenced, but now that it has, I cannot support an amendment in good conscience that would take critical resources from a fund that supports ongoing rehabilitation projects on the Capitol complex. Perhaps, had the gentleman found another source for his funding, we could have been supportive.

I thank the gentleman for his passion on this issue, but I urge Members to vote against the amendment.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. McDERMOTT), who observed the OTA in action in his time here in Congress.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Chairman, I was one of the 16 people who was on that committee. It used to be a committee with four Republicans from the Senate and four Republicans from the House, four Democrats from the Senate and four Democrats from the House. It was a balanced committee. It looked at the technological questions of what we are spending billions of dollars on.

Now we have a choice of where we get our information. The GAO looks backward. All of the government organizations look backward. They don't look forward. That is not their role to imagine what will happen out there. What we need is an organization that can look forward as we proceed to spend billions of dollars in technology. We

can either get the information from a nonpartisan organization that is controlled evenly by both sides of the House and the other body, or we could go to industry. They will come in here, and they will give us all of the information of their having the best thing since sliced bread.

I think we need the OTA, and I urge you to adopt the amendment.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), my good friend, a member of the Appropriations Committee, someone who has also observed the OTA in practice.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my friend representing Princeton, New Jersey, who has a doctorate in physics, who is a "Jeopardy!" award winner, who is, perhaps, one of the most academically advanced Members of the Congress. It is interesting that he is the one who knows enough to know what we don't know in this Congress. My concern is that many of us don't know enough to know what we don't know.

Madam Chairman, the size of computers is shrinking by about 50 percent every couple of years, and their capacity—their power and their speed—is doubling, yet we can't understand the implications of that, which applies to all of our constituencies. We just mandated that 30 percent of the energy that the military spends, which is billions of dollars, has to be from non-carbon-polluting forms of energy. Do we know whether that is achievable? We just committed yesterday \$11 billion for computer interoperability for electronic medical records.

We have to understand the implications of our decisions, and the OTA helps us to be able to do that.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, in closing, for almost a quarter of a century, the OTA was one of the most respected, productive, cost-efficient agencies we have seen, producing comprehensive reports for the House and the Senate on issues related to health care policy, agricultural production, telecommunications, space policy, electronic surveillance, national defense, and much more. It prevented decisions made in ignorance, and ignorance is expensive.

My friend from Oklahoma and also the ranking member, the gentlelady from Florida, talked about cost. What we are talking about here is finding the low-hanging fruit on making government more efficient. That is what the OTA did. That is what the OTA would do. This is the last Legislative Branch appropriations I will be dealing with. I know the OTA. I worked as a staffer on Capitol Hill. I saw that it works. I saw how much it elevated the debate here on Capitol Hill. It saves taxpayer money. I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Again, I want to thank my friend because I know he is, indeed, committed to this idea.

In closing, Madam Chair, I think, as usual, my friend Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ probably made the salient point of the debate. We are taking from our historic trust fund, which preserves this building, and redirects that resource. That is a mistake. That is just simply a mistake. If there is another way to fund it, I would still have grave reservations about reintroducing it because I do think the information is available elsewhere, but robbing from your seed corn, I think, is something we shouldn't do.

We have established this fund. We have been able to maintain it under Democrats and Republicans alike. We are going to have these challenges going forward. I do not want to set the precedent of this becoming a piggy bank to fund other things out of. We need to maintain our campus. This is an important way to do it, and I think weakening it in any way would be counterproductive.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–426 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. NUGENT of Florida.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 221, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

## AYES—196

Amodei	Franks (AZ)	Noem
Barber	Gabbard	Nolan
Barletta	Gallego	Nugent
Barr	Garcia	Nunnelee
Barrow (GA)	Gibbs	O'Rourke
Benishke	Gibson	Olson
Bentivolio	Gohmert	Palazzo
Bera (CA)	Goodlatte	Perry
Bilirakis	Granger	Peters (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Graves (GA)	Peters (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Petri
Black	Hahn	Pittenger
Blackburn	Hall	Pitts
Blumenauer	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Braley (IA)	Harper	Posey
Bridenstine	Harris	Price (NC)
Brooks (AL)	Hartzler	Reed
Brooks (IN)	Heck (NV)	Reichert
Broun (GA)	Heck (WA)	Ribble
Brownley (CA)	Hensarling	Rigell
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Roe (TN)
Bucshon	Himes	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Holding	Rokita
Bustos	Hudson	Ross
Byrne	Huelskamp	Royce
Camp	Huizenga (MI)	Ruiz
Campbell	Hurt	Salmon
Cantor	Israel	Sanford
Capito	Jenkins	Scalise
Capps	Jones	Schneider
Cassidy	Jordan	Schrader
Castor (FL)	Joyce	Scott (VA)
Coble	Kilmer	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Kuster
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Shea-Porter
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Sinema
Cook	Lance	Slaughter
Cooper	Lankford	Smith (MO)
Costa	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Cotton	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Courtney	LoBiondo	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Daines	Long	Southerland
Davis (CA)	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Lujan Grisham	Stivers
DeFazio	(NM)	Stutzman
Delaney	Lujan, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
DeBene	(NM)	Takano
Denham	Lummis	Tiberi
Dent	Maffei	Tierney
DeSantis	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
DesJarlais	Marino	Upton
Duckworth	Massie	Wagner
Duffy	Matheson	Walden
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Walorski
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Walz
Ellmers	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Esty	McKinley	Webster (FL)
Farr	McMorris	Wenstrup
Fincher	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Fitzpatrick	Meehan	Williams
Fleischmann	Meng	Wilson (SC)
Fleming	Messer	Wittman
Flores	Mullin	Woodall
Forbes	Murphy (FL)	Yoder
Foster	Napolitano	

## NOES—221

Aderholt	Clarke (NY)	Fattah
Amash	Clay	Fortenberry
Bachmann	Cleaver	Foxx
Bachus	Clyburn	Frankel (FL)
Barton	Cole	Fudge
Bass	Conaway	Garamendi
Beatty	Connolly	Gardner
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Garrett
Bonamici	Crawford	Gerlach
Boustany	Crenshaw	Gosar
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Gowdy
Brady (TX)	Cuellar	Grayson
Brown (FL)	Culberson	Green, Al
Butterfield	Cummings	Green, Gene
Calvert	Davis, Danny	Griffin (AR)
Capuano	DeGette	Griffith (VA)
Cárdenas	DeLauro	Grijalva
Carney	Grimm	Guthrie
Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Hanabusa
Carter	Dingell	Hastings (FL)
Cartwright	Doggett	Hastings (WA)
Castro (TX)	Doyle	Higgins
Chabot	Edwards	Holt
Chaffetz	Ellison	Honda
Chu	Engel	Horsford
Ciilline	Eshoo	Hoyer
Clark (MA)	Farenthold	

Huffman	Mica	Sánchez, Linda
Hultgren	Michaud	T.
Hunter	Miller (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta
Issa	Miller, Gary	Sarbanes
Jackson Lee	Miller, George	Schakowsky
Jeffries	Moore	Schiff
Johnson (GA)	Moran	Schock
Johnson (OH)	Mulvaney	Schweikert
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (PA)	Scott, David
Johnson, Sam	Nadler	Serrano
Jolly	Neal	Sewell (AL)
Kaptur	Negrete McLeod	Sherman
Keating	Neugebauer	Shimkus
Kelly (IL)	Nunes	Shuster
Kelly (PA)	Owens	Simpson
Kennedy	Pallone	Sires
Pitts	Pascrell	Smith (NE)
Kind	Pastor (AZ)	Speier
King (IA)	Paulsen	Terry
King (NY)	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Kinzinger (IL)	Pearce	Thompson (MS)
Kline	Pelosi	Thompson (PA)
Labrador	Perlmutter	Thornberry
Langevin	Peterson	Tipton
Larsen (WA)	Pingree (ME)	Titus
Larson (CT)	Pocan	Tsongas
Latham	Polis	Turner
Lee (CA)	Pompeo	Valadao
Levin	Price (GA)	Van Hollen
Lewis	Quigley	Vargas
Lipinski	Rahall	Veasey
Loebsack	Rangel	Vela
Lowenthal	Renacci	Velázquez
Lowey	Rice (SC)	Viscosky
Lucas	Rice (SC)	Walberg
Lynch	Roby	Wasserman
Maloney,	Rogers (MI)	Schultz
Carolyn	Rohrabacher	Waters
Marchant	Rooney	Waxman
Matsui	Ros-Lehtinen	Welch
McCarthy (CA)	Roskam	Whitfield
McCarthy (NY)	Rothfus	Wilson (FL)
McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Wolf
McGovern	Runyan	Womack
McKeon	Ruppersberger	Yarmuth
McNeerney	Rush	Yoho
Meadows	Ryan (OH)	Young (AK)
Meeks	Ryan (WI)	Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—14

Becerra	Hinojosa	Richmond
Enyart	McAllister	Rogers (KY)
Frelinghuysen	McCollum	Schwartz
Gingrey (GA)	McIntyre	Stockman
Gutiérrez	Miller (FL)	

□ 1126

Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. HANABUSA, Messrs. WALBERG, ROGERS of Michigan, and GRIFFIN of Arkansas changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. COURTNEY, TONKO, SCOTT of Virginia, LUETKE-MEYER, GRAVES of Missouri, CAMP, GOHMERT, ROKITA, BURGESS, and Mrs. BLACK changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Gosar) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 198, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

## AYES—219

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Perry
Amash	Graves (MO)	Peters (CA)
Bachmann	Green, Gene	Peters (MI)
Barber	Griffin (AR)	Peterson
Barletta	Griffith (VA)	Pittenger
Barr	Guthrie	Pitts
Barrow (GA)	Hahn	Poe (TX)
Barton	Hall	Polis
Benishke	Hanna	Pompeo
Bentivolio	Harper	Posey
Bera (CA)	Harris	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Heck (NV)	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Reichert
Black	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Blackburn	Himes	Ribble
Boustany	Holding	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Rigell
Braley (IA)	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Israel	Rokita
Buchanan	Issa	Rooney
Bucshon	Jenkins	Roskam
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Bustos	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Byrne	Jones	Royce
Camp	Jordan	Ruiz
Campbell	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Capito	King (IA)	Sanford
Capps	Kingston	Scalise
Cassidy	Kirkpatrick	Schweikert
Chabot	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Chaffetz	Coble	Sensenbrenner
Cole	LaMalfa	Sessions
Coffman	Lamborn	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Lankford	Simpson
Collins (NY)	Latta	Sinema
Conaway	Lipinski	Smith (MO)
Connolly	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Cook	Loeb sack	Smith (NJ)
Cooper	Long	Smith (TX)
Costa	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Cotton	Lummis	Stivers
Cramer	Maffei	Stutzman
Crawford	Marchant	Terry
Daines	Marino	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	Massie	Tiberi
Denham	Matheson	Tipton
DeSantis	McAllister	Turner
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Upton
Duckworth	McCaul	Wagner
Duffy	McClintock	Walberg
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Walden
Duncan (TN)	McKinley	Walorski
Ellmers	McMorris	Walz
Farenthold	Rodgers	Weber (TX)
Fincher	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	Meehan	Wenstrup
Fleming	Messer	Westmoreland
Flores	Mica	Whitfield
Forbes	Miller, Gary	Williams
Foster	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
	Mulvaney	Wittman
	Neugebauer	Womack
	Noem	Woodall
	Nugent	Yoder
	Nunes	Yoho
	Nunnelee	Young (AK)
	Olson	Young (IN)
	Palazzo	
	Paulsen	
	Pearce	

## NOES—198

Amodei	Castro (TX)	DeGette
Bachus	Chu	Delaney
Bass	Cielline	DeLauro
Beatty	Clark (MA)	DeBene
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (NY)	Dent
Blumenauer	Clay	Deutch
Bonamici	Cleaver	Diaz-Balart
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Dingell
Brown (FL)	Cohen	Doggett
Brownley (CA)	Cole	Doyle
Butterfield	Conyers	Edwards
Calvert	Courtney	Ellison
Capps	Crenshaw	Engel
Capuano	Crowley	Eshoo
Cárdenas	Cuellar	Esty
Carney	Culberson	Farr
Carson (IN)	Cummings	Fattah
Carter	Davis (CA)	Fitzpatrick
Cartwright	Davis, Danny	Fortenberry
Castor (FL)	DeFazio	Foster

Foxx	Lowey	Ruppersberger	[Roll No. 190]	Grijalva	Lynch	Sarbanes
Frankel (FL)	Lucas	Rush		Grimm	Maloney,	Schakowsky
Frelinghuysen	Lujan Grisham	Ryan (OH)	AYES—207	Hall	Carolyn	Schiff
Fudge	(NM)	Sánchez, Linda		Hanabusa	Maloney, Sean	Schneider
Gallego	Luján, Ben Ray	T.		Hanna	McCarthy (NY)	Schock
Garamendi	(NM)	Sanchez, Loretta		Hastings (FL)	McDermott	Schrader
Gerlach	Lynch	Sarbanes		Hastings (WA)	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Gibson	Maloney,	Schakowsky		Heck (WA)	McIntyre	Scott, David
Grayson	Carolyn	Schiff		Higgins	McKeon	Serrano
Green, Al	Maloney, Sean	Schneider		Himes	McNerney	Sewell (AL)
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Schock		Holt	Meeks	Shea-Porter
Grimm	McDermott	Schrader		Honda	Meng	Sherman
Hanabusa	McGovern	Scott (VA)		Horsford	Michaud	Sherman
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Scott, David		Hoyer	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Serrano		Huffman	Miller, George	Simpson
Heck (WA)	McNerney	Sewell (AL)		Israel	Moore	Sires
Higgins	Meeks	Shea-Porter		Jackson Lee	Moran	Slaughter
Holt	Meng	Sherman		Jeffries	Murphy (PA)	Smith (WA)
Honda	Michaud	Shimkus		Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Speier
Horsford	Miller (MI)	Sires		Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Swalwell (CA)
Hoyer	Miller, George	Slaughter		Jolly	Neal	Takano
Huffman	Moore	Smith (WA)		Joyce	Negrete McLeod	Thompson (CA)
Jackson Lee	Moran	Speier		Kaptur	Nolan	Thompson (MS)
Jeffries	Murphy (FL)	Stewart		Keating	O'Rourke	Thompson (PA)
Johnson (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Swalwell (CA)		Kelly (IL)	Owens	Tiberi
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Takano		Kennedy	Pallone	Tierney
Jolly	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)		Kildee	Pascarell	Titus
Kaptur	Neal	Thompson (MS)		Kilmer	Pastor (AZ)	Tonko
Keating	Negrete McLeod	Thompson (PA)		Kind	Payne	Turner
Kelly (IL)	Nolan	Tierney		King (NY)	Pelosi	Valadao
Kennedy	O'Rourke	Titus		Kinzinger (IL)	Perlmutter	Van Hollen
Kildee	Owens	Tonko		Kline	Peterson	Vargas
Kilmer	Pallone	Tsongas		Kuster	Pingree (ME)	Veasey
Kind	Pascarell	Van Hollen		Langevin	Pocan	Vela
King (NY)	Pastor (AZ)	Vargas		Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Kinzinger (IL)	Payne	Veasey		Larson (CT)	Quigley	Visclosky
Kline	Pelosi	Waxman		Latham	Rahall	Walz
Kuster	Perlmutter	Welch		Lee (CA)	Rangel	Wasserman
Lance	Petri	Wilson (FL)		Levin	Reichert	Schultz
Langevin	Pingree (ME)	Wolf		Lewis	Roby	Waters
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Yarmuth		Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen	Waxman
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)			Lofgren	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Latham	Quigley			Lowenthal	Runyan	Westmoreland
Lee (CA)	Rangel			Lowey	Ruppersberger	Williams
Levin	Roby			Lucas	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Lewis	Ros-Lehtinen			Lujan Grisham	Ryan (OH)	Wolf
Lofgren	Roybal-Allard			(NM)	Sánchez, Linda	Womack
Lowenthal	Runyan			Luján, Ben Ray	T.	Yarmuth
				(NM)	Sanchez, Loretta	

## NOT VOTING—14

Becerra	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Enyart	Matsui	Schwartz
Gingrey (GA)	McCollum	Stockman
Gutiérrez	Miller (FL)	Visclosky
Hinojosa	Richmond	

□ 1132

Mr. DELANEY changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT. Madam Chair, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 189. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 212, not voting 12, as follows:

Amash	Goodlatte	Palazzo
Amodei	Gosar	Paulsen
Bachmann	Gowdy	Pearce
Barber	Graves (GA)	Perry
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Peters (CA)
Barr	Griffin (AR)	Peters (MI)
Barrow (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Petri
Barton	Guthrie	Pittenger
Benishek	Hahn	Pitts
Bentivolio	Harper	Poe (TX)
Bera (CA)	Harris	Polis
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Pompeo
Bishop (NY)	Heck (NV)	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Black	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Blackburn	Holding	Renacci
Boustany	Hudson	Ribble
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Braley (IA)	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Hurt	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Jenkins	Rokita
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Bustos	Jones	Ross
Byrne	Jordan	Rothfus
Camp	Kelly (PA)	Royce
Campbell	King (IA)	Ruiz
Cantor	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Capito	Kirkpatrick	Salmon
Cassidy	Labrador	Sanford
Chabot	LaMalfa	Scalise
Chaffetz	Lamborn	Schweikert
Coble	Lance	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Latta	Sessions
Collins (NY)	LoBiondo	Shuster
Conaway	Loeb sack	Sinema
Connolly	Long	Smith (MO)
Cook	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Costa	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Cotton	Maffei	Smith (TX)
Cramer	Marchant	Southerland
Crawford	Marino	Stewart
Daines	Massie	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Matheson	Stutzman
Denham	McAllister	Terry
Dent	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
DeSantis	McCaul	Tipton
DesJarlais	McClintock	Tsongas
Duckworth	McHenry	Upton
Duffy	McKinley	Wagner
Duncan (SC)	McMorris	Walberg
Duncan (TN)	Rodgers	Walden
Ellmers	Meadows	Walorski
Farenthold	Meehan	Weber (TX)
Fincher	Messer	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	Mica	Wenstrup
Fleming	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Flores	Mullin	Wittman
Forbes	Mulvaney	Woodall
Foxx	Murphy (FL)	Yoder
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Yoho
Gabbard	Noem	Young (AK)
Gardner	Nugent	Young (IN)
Garrett	Nunes	
Gibbs	Nunnelee	
Gohmert	Olson	

## NOES—212

Aderholt	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Bachus	Clay	Doyle
Bass	Cleaver	Edwards
Beatty	Clyburn	Ellison
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Engel
Blumenauer	Cole	Eshoo
Bonamici	Conyers	Esty
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Farr
Brown (FL)	Courtney	Fattah
Brownley (CA)	Crenshaw	Fitzpatrick
Butterfield	Crowley	Fortenberry
Calvert	Cuellar	Foster
Capps	Culberson	Frankel (FL)
Capuano	Cummings	Frelinghuysen
Cárdenas	Davis (CA)	Fudge
Carney	Davis, Danny	Gallego
Carson (IN)	DeFazio	Garamendi
Carter	DeGette	Garcia
Cartwright	Delaney	Gerlach
Castor (FL)	DeLauro	Gibson
Castro (TX)	DeBene	Granger
Chu	Deutch	Grayson
Cicilline	Diaz-Balart	Green, Al
Clark (MA)	Dingell	Green, Gene

## NOT VOTING—12

Becerra	Hinojosa	Richmond
Enyart	Matsui	Rogers (KY)
Gingrey (GA)	McCollum	Schwartz
Gutiérrez	Miller (FL)	Stockman

□ 1136

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 248, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

## AYES—164

Barber	Blumenauer	Capuano
Barrow (GA)	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Bass	Braley (IA)	Carney
Beatty	Brown (FL)	Carson (IN)
Bera (CA)	Brownley (CA)	Cartwright
Bishop (GA)	Bustos	Cassidy
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Castor (FL)



Castro (TX)	Honda	Pastor (AZ)	McKeon	Ribble	Southerland
Chu	Huffman	Payne	McKinley	Rice (SC)	Stewart
Ciilline	Israel	Pelosi	McMorris	Rigell	Stivers
Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Perlmutter	Rodgers	Roby	Stutzman
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Peters (CA)	Meadows	Roe (TN)	Terry
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Peters (MI)	Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)
Cleaver	Jones	Petri	Messer	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Cohen	Keating	Pingree (ME)	Mica	Rohrabacher	Tipton
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Pocan	Miller (MI)	Rokita	Titus
Conyers	Kennedy	Polis	Miller, Gary	Rooney	Turner
Cooper	Kilmer	Price (NC)	Moore	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Courtney	Kind	Quigley	Mullin	Roskam	Valadao
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Rangel	Mulvaney	Ross	Vela
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Ruiz	Murphy (PA)	Rothfus	Wagner
Davis, Danny	Lance	Ruppersberger	Neugebauer	Roybal-Allard	Walberg
DeFazio	Langevin	Rush	Noem	Royce	Walden
DeGette	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)	Nugent	Runyan	Walorski
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Salmon	Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Walz
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Sánchez, Linda	Nunnelee	Sanford	Wasserman
DeBene	Levin	T.	O'Rourke	Scalise	Schultz
Deutch	Lewis	Sanchez, Loretta	Olson	Schock	Weber (TX)
Dingell	Lipinski	Sarbanes	Palazzo	Schrader	Webster (FL)
Doggett	LoBiondo	Schakowsky	Paulsen	Schweikert	Wenstrup
Doyle	Loeb sack	Schiff	Pearce	Scott, Austin	Westmoreland
Duckworth	Lofgren	Schneider	Perry	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Edwards	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)	Peterson	Sessions	Williams
Ellison	Lowe y	Scott, David	Pittenger	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (SC)
Engel	Lujan Grisham	Serrano	Pitts	Shimkus	Wittman
Eshoo	(NM)	Shea-Porter	Poe (TX)	Shuster	Wolf
Esty	Luján, Ben Ray	Sherman	Pompeo	Simpson	Womack
Farenthold	(NM)	Slaughter	Posey	Sinema	Woodall
Farr	Lynch	Smith (WA)	Price (GA)	Sires	Yoder
Fattah	Matheson	Smithwell (CA)	Rahall	Smith (MO)	Yoho
Foster	McDermott	Takano	Reed	Smith (NE)	Young (AK)
Fudge	McGovern	Thompson (CA)	Reichert	Smith (NJ)	Young (IN)
Garamendi	McNerney	Thompson (MS)	Renacci	Smith (TX)	
Garcia	Meeks	Tiberi			
Grayson	Meng	Tierney	Amodei	Kaptur	Schwartz
Green, Al	Michaud	Tonko	Becerra	Matsui	Speier
Green, Gene	Miller, George	Van Hollen	Coble	McCollum	Stockman
Grijalva	Moran	Vargas	Enyart	Miller (FL)	Tsongas
Hahn	Murphy (FL)	Veasey	Gingrey (GA)	Negrete McLeod	Waters
Hanabusa	Nadler	Velázquez	Gutiérrez	Richmond	
Harris	Napolitano	Visclosky	Hinojosa	Rogers (KY)	
Hastings (FL)	Neal	Waxman			
Heck (WA)	Nolan	Welch			
Higgins	Owens	Wilson (FL)			
Himes	Pallone	Yarmuth			
Holt	Pascrell				

## NOES—248

Aderholt	Daines	Holding
Amash	Davis, Rodney	Horsford
Bachmann	Denham	Hoyer
Bachus	Dent	Hudson
Barletta	DeSantis	Huelskamp
Barr	DesJarlais	Huizenga (MI)
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Hultgren
Benishek	Duffy	Hunter
Bentivolio	Duncan (SC)	Hurt
Bilirakis	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Bishop (UT)	Ellmers	Jackson Lee
Black	Fincher	Jenkins
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Boustany	Fleischmann	Johnson, Sam
Brady (PA)	Fleming	Jolly
Brady (TX)	Flores	Jordan
Bridenstine	Forbes	Joyce
Brooks (AL)	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Fox	Kildee
Broun (GA)	Frankel (FL)	King (IA)
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Bucshon	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Burgess	Gabbard	Kinzinger (IL)
Butterfield	Gallego	Kline
Byrne	Gardner	Labrador
Calvert	Garrett	LaMalfa
Camp	Gerlach	Lamborn
Campbell	Gibbs	Lankford
Cantor	Gibson	Latham
Capito	Gohmert	Latta
Carter	Goodlatte	Long
Chabot	Gosar	Lucas
Chaffetz	Gowdy	Luetkemeyer
Clyburn	Granger	Lummis
Coffman	Graves (GA)	Maffei
Cole	Graves (MO)	Maloney,
Collins (GA)	Griffin (AR)	Carolyn
Collins (NY)	Griffith (VA)	Maloney, Sean
Conaway	Grimm	Marchant
Cook	Guthrie	Marino
Costa	Hall	Massie
Cotton	Hanna	McAllister
Cramer	Harper	McCarthy (CA)
Crawford	Hartzler	McCarthy (NY)
Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)	McCaul
Crowley	Heck (NV)	McClintock
Cuellar	Hensarling	McHenry
Culberson	Herrera Beutler	McIntyre

Mr. RUIZ. I am opposed in its current form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Ruiz moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4487 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 2, line 11, strike "\$1,180,736,000" and insert "\$1,181,236,000".

Page 5, line 16, strike "\$285,620,336" and insert "\$286,120,336".

Page 6, line 2 (relating to amounts made available for the Wounded Warrior Program), strike "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$3,000,000".

Page 19, line 12 (relating to amounts made available for Books for the Blind and Physically Handicapped), strike "\$50,429,000" and insert "\$50,696,000".

Page 22, line 16 (relating to amounts made available for the Government Printing Office Revolving Fund), strike "\$11,348,000" and insert "\$10,581,000".

□ 1145

Mr. COLE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HOYER. Objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Here in Congress, we wrestle with some of the hardest choices about the future of our great Nation, but sometimes these choices are very easy. Some choices cut across party lines, define our values as Americans, and give us an opportunity to stand together and fight for what is important.

The easy choice today is to either fund more wasteful and outdated printing services or fund the Wounded Warrior Program. The Wounded Warrior Program in Congress provides paid fellowships for injured veterans to work in congressional offices across the country to help serve other veterans and gain work experience as they assimilate back into civilian life.

There has never been a more important time for the heroes who have defended our country to play these pivotal roles in shaping our laws. I have the honor of working with a Wounded Warrior fellow in my office, and I have seen firsthand their dedication and greatness.

Chris Rennick is a marine from the 1st Battalion in Twentynine Palms, California, who served in Iraq. He was raised on a farm by his godparents, Linda and David Matheny. Mr.

## NOT VOTING—19

Amodei	Kaptur	Schwartz
Becerra	Matsui	Speier
Coble	McCollum	Stockman
Enyart	Miller (FL)	Tsongas
Gingrey (GA)	Negrete McLeod	Waters
Gutiérrez	Richmond	
Hinojosa	Rogers (KY)	

□ 1141

Ms. KELLY of Illinois changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4487) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 557, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

## MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?



Matheny always told him, “Chris, do your best,” and that is exactly what Chris did.

He deployed twice with the United States Marine Corps. His first was with the “tip of the spear” in the first invasion of Iraq in 2003. Chris was injured in an IED blast in his first deployment and still returned to Iraq for a second tour in 2004, and again was injured in an IED explosion.

Chris served honorably and received the Good Conduct Medal, the Combat Action Medal, and the Iraq Expeditionary Medal. Chris’ unit received the Presidential Unit Citation.

After serving in the Marines, Chris came home and dealt with a traumatic brain injury and posttraumatic stress disorder. He told me he was in a bad place. He struggled to hold down three jobs while caring for himself. It was a fellow veteran in the Wounded Warrior battalion who reached out and helped Chris get back on track. Now Chris does the same for others, as a Wounded Warrior fellow.

Chris joined the Wounded Warrior Program because he still firmly believes in the Marine Corps motto, “Semper Fidelis,” always faithful. Chris remains always faithful to his brothers in arms and to this day is always faithful to our great country that he sacrificed for.

In his short time with my office, less than 1 year, Chris has helped over 300 veterans in my district alone receive the benefits that they have earned and get the care that they need. Chris’ passion for helping veterans is an inspiration for me and, I know, for all of you, and that is the reason why we must fully fund the Wounded Warrior Program.

My motion to recommit would fund the Wounded Warrior Program with 30 slots for both Republicans and Democrats by redirecting \$767,000 from the Government Printing Office. Additionally, it would provide \$267,000 for Books for the Blind and Handicapped. We can do all of this with no new spending.

So the choice today is clear and it is easy: Would you rather fund more printed outdated copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and House legislative calendar, or would you rather support our Wounded Warrior fellows like Chris?

This institution and this entire country needs heroes’ voices like Chris’ in every decision that we make. I urge you to vote “yes” and support our veterans and those with disabilities by supporting these critical programs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, after spending the last few hours debating and amending this bill, we have before us a bipartisan piece of legislation that funds this House, its safety, and the agencies that support the legislative

process, and all in a fiscally responsible and, frankly, bipartisan way.

Yesterday, in nearly a unanimous fashion, this House passed a bill that provided nearly \$4 billion in funding that directly supports and assists our wounded warriors, and I think most all of us on both sides of the aisle are proud of that.

This includes \$2.6 billion for the Prosthetic and Sensory Aids Service, \$560 million for the largest system of spinal cord injury of care in the United States, and \$135 million to assist blind and visually impaired veterans. It also includes \$96 million for research that benefits wounded warriors in areas like prosthetics, traumatic brain injury, spinal cord injuries, and the like.

The total medical care budget of the VA for FY15 is \$59.1 billion, enough to care for 6.7 million patients and, again, is something that I think every Member in this House ought to be proud of and was more than delighted to support.

This legislation, as with all appropriations legislation that we bring to the floor, makes every stride to ensure that the very best care for our wounded warriors and veterans is available. I know that I speak for this entire body when I say we deeply respect and respect the service and sacrifices of our troops and veterans and that the bill we passed yesterday is hard-and-fast proof of that.

Frankly, had we wanted to do more, I would suggest that yesterday would have been the time to do more because, clearly, everybody was willing to support that measure.

Keep in mind, the bill before us now is the smallest of the 12 appropriations bills, but it is still incredibly important; and advancing this bill gets us one step closer to completing our necessary work, our constitutional duty of funding the Federal Government.

Motions to recommit like this one, quite frankly, are mostly political “gotcha” tactics, and both sides do it. I cast no partisan stones here. I have seen it happen on this floor many, many times before. But I think both sides probably ought to stop and reflect if we are really honoring the veterans or if we are using them to make a political point. I would hope not the latter, because yesterday we did the right thing; today we are trying to score points at one another’s expense.

Yes, both sides have done this. I am sorry it happens. My personal opinion is that it shouldn’t, and I hope we will dispense with it going forward.

The bill in front of us has bipartisan support. If it is allowed to proceed, it will pass overwhelmingly.

Over the past 2 days, we have done some great work, kicking off the appropriations process at the earliest date in decades and passing our first bill yesterday with overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle. Let’s continue that good work today. Let’s pass this bill. Let’s reject the motion to recommit. Let’s get the work of the people done.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 222, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

#### AYES—194

Barber	Garamendi	Nadler
Barrow (GA)	Garcia	Napolitano
Bass	Grayson	Neal
Beatty	Green, Al	Nolan
Bera (CA)	Green, Gene	O’Rourke
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Owens
Bishop (NY)	Hahn	Pallone
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Pascarell
Bonamici	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Payne
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Pelosi
Brown (GA)	Himes	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Holt	Peters (CA)
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Peters (MI)
Bustos	Horsford	Peterson
Butterfield	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Capps	Huffman	Pocan
Capuano	Israel	Polis
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Posey
Carney	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Castor (FL)	Jones	Rangel
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Chu	Keating	Ruiz
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver	Kind	T.
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Kuster	Sarbanes
Connolly	Langevin	Schakowsky
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Costa	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Courtney	Levin	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Lewis	Scott, David
Cuellar	Lipinski	Serrano
Cummings	Loebach	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Sherman
DeFazio	Lowe	Sinema
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Sires
Delaney	(NM)	Slaughter
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)
DelBene	(NM)	Speier
Deutch	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Dingell	Maffei	Takano
Doggett	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Tierney
Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Titus
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
Ellison	McDermott	Tsongas
Engel	McGovern	Van Hollen
Eshoo	McIntyre	Vargas
Esty	McNerney	Veasey
Farr	Meeks	Vela
Fattah	Meng	Velázquez
Foster	Michaud	Visclosky
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Walz
Fudge	Moore	Wasserman
Gabbard	Moran	
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	

SchultzWaters  
WaxmanWelch  
Wilson (FL)Yarmuth  
NOES—222

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 14, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—402

Aderholt  
Amash  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Ellmers  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Frelinghuysen  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)

NOT VOTING—15

Becerra  
Coble  
Enyart  
Franks (AZ)  
Gingrey (GA)

□ 1202

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

Perry  
Petri  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Price (GA)  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southerland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce

Negrete McLeod  
Richmond  
Rogers (KY)  
Schwartz  
Stockman

Aderholt  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Bass  
Beatty  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bera (CA)  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cartwright  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chu  
Cielline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cotton  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Daines  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Denham  
Dent

DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Poster  
Foxy  
Frankel (FL)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hahn  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Holding  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huffman  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kaptur

Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Kuster  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Lofgren  
Long  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lummis  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
McAllister  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nolan  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell

Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger

Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southerland  
Speier  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)

NAYS—14

Amash  
Broun (GA)  
Duncan (TN)  
Engel  
Franks (AZ)

Green, Gene  
Holt  
Jones  
Labrador  
Massie

Matheson  
Rogers (AL)  
Sanchez, Linda T.  
Wittman

NOT VOTING—15

Becerra  
Coble  
Enyart  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gutierrez

Hinojosa  
Matsui  
McCollum  
Miller (FL)  
Negrete McLeod

Payne  
Richmond  
Rogers (KY)  
Schwartz  
Stockman

□ 1208

Mr. RANGEL changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 193, please let the record show that my vote on final passage would have been a “yes.” Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to the devastating impact of recent flooding in my district, I missed the following rollcall votes: No. 188–193 on May 1, 2014. If present, I would have voted: rollcall vote No. 188—Nugent of Florida Amendment to H.R. 4487, “aye,” rollcall vote No. 189—Gosar of Arizona Amendment to H.R. 4487, “aye,” rollcall vote No. 190—Broun of Georgia Amendment to H.R. 4487, “aye,” rollcall vote No. 191—Holt of New Jersey Amendment to H.R. 4487, “nay,” rollcall vote No. 192—H.R. 4487, Motion to Recommit, “nay,” rollcall vote No. 193—H.R. 4487, Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2015, “aye.”

□ 1215

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule, and I yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House is not in session.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 4438, the American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2014, sponsored by Representative KEVIN BRADY. This bill will provide American businesses with the certainty they need to invest in good-paying middle class jobs and develop the technologies of the future.

The House is also scheduled to consider a privileged resolution finding Lois G. Lerner, former Director, Exempt Organizations Division, Internal Revenue Service, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act, authored by Chairman JOHN KLINE. Mr. Speaker, America does not work if our children are trapped in failing schools. This bipartisan bill provides an opportunity for our children to attend schools which foster a quality learning environment focused on those students succeeding.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information with reference to the legislation for next week. He leads with a bill that is entitled American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2014.

As the gentleman knows, we have an agenda which I have talked to him about briefly. We call it Make It In America, which is essentially about growing manufacturing and encouraging manufacturers to return to the United States and encouraging people when they want to go into manufacturing to do so here in America.

Not only will that provide for a "Made in America" label all over the world, but it will also provide the kind of middle class jobs and opportunities that we need.

Part of that agenda, I will tell my friend, is to make permanent the research and development tax credit. This bill does that. This bill also costs somewhere in the neighborhood of \$150 billion, maybe a little less, over 10 years. It is unpaid for.

The series of bills that were passed by the Ways and Means Committee will cost \$310 billion. They are also unpaid for. I suggest to my friend—and as he knows, I preach relatively regularly that one of the things that we need to do for the business community and for America is to get ourselves on a fiscally sustainable path.

Mr. CAMP offered a comprehensive piece of legislation, Mr. Leader, as you know, which I think was an honest effort, but it also made hard choices. It made hard choices not to increase the deficit and, therefore, provided offsets for tax cuts. I think that is absolutely essential for us to do.

This bill that we will consider next week, which is a proposition I think most of us support, and that is giving businesses the insurance that the research and development tax credit will in fact be available not only for 1 year, but for a series of years—in this case, I believe 10 years.

What the business community doesn't need and what America doesn't need is making the deficit worse. As a matter of fact, Mr. Leader, your party talks a lot about bringing the deficit down. This goes in exactly the opposite direction, and I think that is lamentable. I said \$150 billion. It is actually \$155 billion over 10 years.

I would hope that the party that is demanding that unemployment insurance be paid for, that is demanding that the sustainable growth rate be paid for, and that any change in the sequester be paid for, ought to have consistency and not add \$155 billion to our deficit in a vote next week on something that I think we are all for; and it is easy, Mr. Leader, as you well know, to vote for tax cuts—easy. It takes no courage whatsoever.

I have been at this business 45 years. It has been my experience that, over those 45 years, it is easy for Members to vote for tax cuts. What is hard to do is to pay for the policies you adopt. This bill does not do that. This bill makes the deficit worse, exacerbates the lack of confidence that Americans have in the fiscal responsibility of their country, and puts us in a worse place.

So I would hope, Mr. Leader, that before this bill comes to the floor, that you and the Rules Committee and Mr. CAMP, as he did in the bill that he offered to this House, which was, frankly, dismissed out of hand because it made tough decisions, this bill makes no tough decisions. It has a tax cut. It has all the candy and none of the spinach.

It is all good, and nobody has to pay the price. Nobody has to take responsibility. I think that is lamentable, and I would hope that, before this bill

comes to the floor, there would be a way to pay for this bill.

I want to suggest to you that there is a way to pay for it. There is a way to pay for the other extenders that the committee wants, and that is by passing a comprehensive immigration bill.

Mr. BOEHNER indicated that that was not being done because it was tough and people didn't want to do tough things. I understand that. It is hard to do tough things. That is why they are called tough. Mr. BOEHNER now says he was kidding when he said that.

My view is he was deadly serious, and the reason we are considering this bill next week is because it is easy to do. The reason we are not considering comprehensive immigration reform is because it is difficult, but comprehensive immigration reform would pay for all of the tax cuts that are being proposed in these six extenders and, indeed, in all of the extenders that are proposed by the Senate Finance Committee.

They only proposed that for 2 years, not 10 years, but it would pay for all of them. In fact, CBO says if we pass comprehensive immigration reform, it would mean \$200 billion for the next 10 years and \$900 billion over the next 20 years.

In December, the Budget Committee chairs, Mr. RYAN and Mrs. MURRAY, were able to come up with a substantial sequester replacement. We ought to be able to do that as well.

Let me close this part of my comment with two quotes, one from Republican Secretary of the Treasury Hank Paulson, who said:

As a general rule, I don't believe that tax cuts pay for themselves.

And then Mr. Alan Greenspan, who initially said in 2001 and 2003 that he thought the tax cuts would pay for themselves. However, upon review of those tax cuts, he came back in response to a question on "Meet the Press" from David Gregory, and the question was:

You don't agree with the Republican leaders who say tax cuts pay for themselves?

Mr. Greenspan:

They do not.

So all of your Republican colleagues are being asked to vote for a \$155 billion increase in the deficit, which they all say they want to bring down. I am sure they will get up and rationalize—as they did in 1981, in 2001, and 2003—that those tax cuts would magically grow the economy, so that they would not exacerbate the deficit. In the 33 years I have been in Congress, that has not been our experience.

So, Mr. Leader, I very sincerely hope that we can join together in a bipartisan way and support this legislation because it is the right thing to do in terms of growing manufacturing, and it is the right thing to do in bringing down our deficit to pay for it.

I yield to my friend.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The Chair reminds Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that for 30-plus years, the R&D tax credit has been on temporary extension. This is nothing but reflecting reality, saying that this is a very important part of incentives, so that we can fulfill the mission that the gentleman is on, that we share as well, which is more manufacturing here in America.

If making it in America is important, the R&D tax credit is fundamental to that mission. This has been in place for over 30 years on temporary extension, and to hold it hostage as the gentleman suggests, Mr. Speaker, is not the way to go about facilitating growth in our economy.

I respect the gentleman's commitment to fiscal discipline. Obviously, we have different opinions about how to get to that goal, but both of us, I think, would agree, Mr. Speaker, that growth is something that has been too little, too tepid, and we need to return to an era in which we can see some robust growth in our economy.

It will help those who are chronically unemployed. It will help businesses grow. It will help communities grow and families get by easier, so they can see a better future. This R&D tax credit is something that, as the gentleman says, he supports, and to support that means support it as it has existed, but let's once and for all send the signal of certainty that this will be the policy for manufacturing and others in this country, so we can continue to innovate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would say that the rationale he uses, however, is applicable to the sustainable growth rate reimbursement for doctors serving Medicare patients. We do that every year as well. The Republican side of the aisle demands that be paid for.

We do unemployment insurance.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield on that.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the difference in the SGR to this is we have consistently offset the expenditures under SGR. This R&D tax credit is a tax credit. It is allowing businesses who invest to keep more of that investment, to plow it back into research.

The precedent is not there, as it is on SGR and the other items that perhaps the gentleman would point to. This is important to growth. This is important to manufacturing. We should all join together and support the current extension of what has been in place for over 30 years, on extension over a dozen times.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his observation, Mr. Speaker. The other side of the aisle laments the deficit; they lament the debt. We have the debt, we have the deficit because we don't pay for what we buy. That is why we have a debt. That is why we have a deficit.

When we were in charge, we put in a pay-as-you-go rule. That rule said, if you are going to spend money, this is essentially a tax expenditure; it is a worthy tax expenditure. It is something that I support. It helps to grow the economy, but it is a tax expenditure.

No one on this floor can say that it does not make the deficit worse; no one with any degree of credibility.

□ 1230

The argument has been made, of course, though, that tax cuts, they will grow so much that you won't get the deficit. That is what President Reagan argued and his proponents argued in 1981. The debt increased 187 percent under President Ronald Reagan because they didn't pay for themselves.

When the Republicans took over, Mr. Speaker, they amended the rule so we didn't have to pay for things. This bill comes to the floor without any necessity to pay for it. So we will give a tax cut, assuming it passes, and somebody is going to pay for it. My children, my grandchildren, your children, Mr. Speaker, they are the ones who will pay for it because we are going to make a decision, apparently, not to pay for something that we know is going to increase the deficit.

So the analogy when we want things paid for is not always followed, Mr. Speaker, for instance, unemployment insurance almost invariably not paid for. Almost every economist says investing in unemployment insurance grows the economy, will help grow the GDP, but we don't follow that practice here, unfortunately.

We have a bipartisan paid-for unemployment insurance bill that the Senate has passed that we can't even get to the floor. That is paid for. It grows the economy and it helps 2.5 million people who are falling through the cracks. Yet we bring a bill to the floor that has a \$155 billion cost, we don't pay for it, and the unemployment insured, 2.5 million, are ignored.

Mr. Speaker, we don't think that policy is one that we ought to pursue. We would hope, again, before this bill comes to the floor that it is paid for.

I referred to comprehensive immigration reform, Mr. Speaker.

I will yield to my friend if he wants to make a comment on a previous comment.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to just point out that the last time the gentleman's party was in the majority in this House during a lame-duck session we did extend the R&D tax credit unpaid for. I hear what the gentleman is saying, but I would point that out for historic accuracy.

I would say this, Mr. Speaker. I guess there may be a little bit of different view on how deficits are created. The disproportionate cause for our deficit is the fact that we have demographics in this country, 10,000 people every day

turning 65 becoming eligible for our health care entitlement programs, and those programs are almost 50 percent—the Medicare program is almost 50 percent underfunded. That is the disproportionate cause of the deficit.

I think all of us have said you can't tax your way out of it; you can't grow your way out of it; you have to change the structure of the program. That is something that the gentleman's party nor the President will agree with us on. That is the disproportionate cause of the deficit.

An additional cause of the deficit is we don't have enough growth; we don't have revenues coming into the Federal Government. For some reason, there has been an acceptance around here of a new norm, a very low and tepid growth. The R&D tax credit is something that is growth oriented; it is certainty. The gentleman said so himself. The gentleman said that manufacturing in America needs certainty in the R&D tax credit.

We have essentially been allowing an R&D tax credit since 1981 in this country. So let's just call it what it is and make it permanent so that we can get back on the path to growth. Addressing growth, addressing our unfunded liabilities connected with entitlement programs, that is the sure way to reduce deficits and reduce the debt burden.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentleman point that out. I have been trying to work with the gentleman and his party for some period of time now starting with Bowles-Simpson and some other comprehensive suggestions.

As I said, Mr. CAMP, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has offered a comprehensive bill. I don't agree with some of the things in it, but it is an honest piece of legislation that makes the tradeoffs, the tough choices, that need to be made. This bill does not. That is my point.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, because I know the majority leader has another engagement, comprehensive immigration reform, I said that it scores approximately \$1 trillion positive for our economy over the next 20 years; but it is also morally the right thing to do to fix a broken system, a system that doesn't work, with which everybody agrees.

I would again appeal to the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, to bring a comprehensive immigration bill to the floor. I understand that there are many on his side of the aisle that don't agree with it. Fine. Vote against it, but give this House an opportunity. Give the American people the opportunity to have a comprehensive immigration bill voted in the people's House on this floor so that we can fix a broken system, or offer alternatives to that which is proposed by the United States Senate and passed overwhelmingly by the United States Senate.

If the gentleman wants me to yield to him, I will, certainly.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just respond, we have had this discussion before. The majority is in opposition to the Senate bill. The Speaker has said as much, and I have said as much.

I have also said, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman, to the President, and others that we have got a lack of trust between this House and the White House. I have said to the President that what could help is we start rebuilding that trust, which starts with an admission that it can't be my way or the highway, and it must instead be building trust, understanding where we can agree together.

Yes, we all agree the system is broken. We have a system that is broken on the legal side, and we have illegal immigration. There are things that this House has done before, like a green card stapled to a diploma. The President says, no, we can't do something like that; we can't do something like that without taking care of everything. That, to me, Mr. Speaker, is where the problem lies.

There is not enough trust on the part of the Members of this body to think that the White House and the administration is going to implement whatever it is that we pass. So instead, why shouldn't we focus on where we agree and start from there? That has been the position that I have expressed to the gentleman as well as to the administration.

So again, I just take issue with his insistence that somehow we can just do that and it will all be fixed. That is the fundamental problem here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental problem is not my way or the highway. It is no way.

The Republican Judiciary Committee has passed out a number of immigration reform bills. The Homeland Security Committee headed by a Republican chairman has passed out an immigration reform bill dealing with border security. None of those bills have been brought to the floor. It is not a question about liking the Senate bill or trusting the President of the United States.

Everybody agrees, Mr. Speaker, the immigration system is broken; but there is no way, no bill, no option that has been brought to this floor to fix that system to respond to what everybody agrees is a broken system of immigration.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Taoiseach, otherwise known as the Prime Minister of Ireland, celebrated St. Patrick's Day here with us at a luncheon, and part of his speech was about passing comprehensive immigration reform.

They don't have to take our bill; they don't have to take the Senate bill; but, Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to have a bill on the floor to fix a broken system. It is not a question of whether they trust the President; it is whether or not they trust the word of the House of Representatives that it

can work its will. I would hope that we could work our will on this issue. It is important for the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### HR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, May 6, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### LET THE STATES LEAD ON JOB CREATION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a recent Monthly Labor Review report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics reiterates that energy production and energy jobs are surging in parts of the country, including my home State of Pennsylvania.

The report, which reviews employment trends from 2007 to 2012, states:

Pennsylvania has seen a surge in natural gas production and employment over the past 2 years, resulting in substantial growth in terms of both employment and wages.

Over the report's study period, Pennsylvania went on from being the tenth largest State by oil and natural gas employment in 2007 to being the sixth largest in 2012, and the Commonwealth also had the second largest employment increase over the same period, positioning itself only after Texas.

We talk a lot about what Washington can do to boost growth and employment. Well, Mr. Speaker, this report speaks to the fact that we should allow private innovation in States like Pennsylvania to lead the way.

#### HUNGER IN AMERICA

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Chairman PAUL RYAN held a hearing on poverty—a timely and necessary conversation. But the problem is that not one single person living in poverty was a witness at that hearing, and that is really a shame.

There are plenty of men and women, like Barbie Izquierdo or Tianna Gaines Turner from the Witnesses to Hunger, who should be invited here to describe what it is like to be hungry or cold simply because there isn't enough money to heat a house and buy enough food to eat. They can describe for Mr.

RYAN how difficult it is to stretch a SNAP allotment for the entire month and, most importantly, how hard it is to make ends meet with a job that pays an inadequate wage.

We need to hear from those who struggle with poverty and not just those think tank gurus. We need to hear what is working and what is not working on the ground in our communities.

Chairman RYAN's hearing missed the mark. When it comes to issues involving poverty and hunger, Mr. Speaker, this majority that runs this House doesn't have a clue.

I urge everyone to listen to real people who are struggling in poverty. Perhaps if we did, this Congress wouldn't be so cruel to poor people.

#### HONORING WORLD WAR II VETERAN DONALD BUSKA

(Mr. DAINES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor Donald Buska, a Montana World War II veteran who passed away earlier this week.

I had the honor to meet Donald on Monday, just a day before he passed away. Donald was in Washington, D.C., as part of the Big Sky Honor Flight, an incredible program that allows Montana veterans to travel to D.C. and see their memorials.

One of the best parts of my job is meeting with these Montana veterans and honoring their service and their sacrifice. It is an honor to hear their stories, to stand with them before the memorials honoring their service, and to shake their hands.

I am glad Donald was able to participate in this once-in-a-lifetime trip to accomplish his lifetime dream.

Thank you, Donald, for your service. Cindy and I join all Montanans in saying "thank you" and keeping your family in our thoughts and prayers.

#### GLOBAL HUNGER/LIVE BELOW THE LINE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is the lunch hour here in Washington, D.C., but for the over 840 million people around the world who are struggling with hunger, an adequate lunch is a luxury they cannot afford. Instead of enjoying food, they are facing a terrible, gnawing pain in their gut right now. By the time I finish this statement, six children will have perished because of hunger or inadequate nutrition.

This week, the World Food Program is asking everyone to try to Live Below the Line—to put yourself in the shoes of the hungry, and to try to get by on

only \$1.50 of food per day—the purchasing power of people living in extreme poverty, as defined by the World Bank. I and members of my staff are taking this challenge. But for millions of people, this is not about 1 day or 1 week. This is about their everyday lives.

It should not be this way. As President Kennedy said over 50 years ago:

We have the ability, we have the means, and we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the Earth. We need only the will.

In the past, Republicans like Bob Dole and Democrats like George McGovern came together. They led this battle against global hunger. Today, we have a moral obligation to continue that battle, to meet our responsibilities to our fellow man and woman—and to our children—and to do what we can to end the scourge of hunger in our own Nation and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, let's take advantage of this challenge. Let us end hunger in this generation.

□ 1245

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF DEPUTY SHERIFF MICHAEL SEVERSON

(Mr. DUFFY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Polk County Deputy Sheriff Michael Severson for his bravery, for his selflessness, and for his sacrifice in the line of duty on April 19, 1991.

On that day, Deputy Severson was shot in the spine and suffered paralysis from the neck down. Also from that incident, his partner, Deputy Allen Albee, lost his life. He was a husband and a father of two.

In the 23 years since that incident, Deputy Severson's life would change as a result of his injuries, but he would never give up on life. Deputy Severson traveled and shared his story with others. He provided inspiration and hope for those struggling to adjust to the challenging life of paralysis.

Then, sadly, on Monday, April 14, Deputy Severson succumbed to his wounds, and he passed away in his hometown of St. Croix Falls, Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 23 years, Deputy Severson persevered. For his bravery, for his selflessness, and for his sacrifice in the line of duty, he is one of our heroes.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all of you to join me in offering our gratitude for his service. On behalf of this entire body, we thank him, and we extend our condolences to his family.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF PASTOR R.C. JOHNSON

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and honor to a great man, Pastor Raymond Charles Johnson, Sr., known in Fort Worth as "R.C. Johnson."

Pastor Johnson moved to Fort Worth in 1953, where he began his work at the Greater Saint James Baptist Church. He was ordained as pastor of the church in 1985, and he dedicated 61 years to the preaching of the Word. Although many in the community knew that he was a pastor, he also worked at General Motors for over 32 years and was a Korean war veteran. In addition to his work in the ministry, he was a precinct chairman for over 50 years in the same precinct.

Pastor Johnson was so proud of his work in Ministers Against Crime, where they went to local schools and worked in communities. I can tell you that they worked in those schools and that they made a difference in those kids' lives—in their behavior and in their grades. He really made a difference in the community.

Sadly, earlier this year, I was at his wife's funeral. They had been married for 63 years. She died back in the January-February time period, which was really, really tough on him. He, too, succumbed just this past week.

I want to thank Pastor Johnson for everything he did to help me and so many other people in the community. He is someone the Fort Worth community will be proud of for many years.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. JERRY UMANOS

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I stand before you today to honor the life of Dr. Jerry Umanos, the father-in-law of my former staff member, Krista Umanos, and the father of her husband, Ben.

Dr. Umanos was killed at the CURE International Hospital in Kabul, Afghanistan, on April 24. He was a pediatrician, a man dedicated to his Christian faith, who felt called to serve those in need. Since 2005, this calling led him to Afghanistan to treat patients and to train Afghan medical personnel. Dr. Umanos had a love of and a dedication to the people of Afghanistan—a love that transcended the typical call to serve.

His wife, Jan, asked that we honor her husband's memory by opening our hearts to the Afghan people and to everyone around the world who needs to see Christ's love for all.

Dr. Umanos' caring for all mankind, regardless of country or creed or religion, is inspiring. His death is a loss for his family and friends, as it is a loss for all of those touched by his selfless service. While Dr. Umanos' earthly mission is complete, the positive effects of his works in this world shall never perish.

God bless Dr. Jerry Umanos and his family.

You have made the world a better place.

#### HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon because of interference in the local affairs of the District of Columbia that is about to take place pursuant to a hearing that has been called by the Government Operations Subcommittee of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

First, let me be clear. The Oversight and Government Reform Committee, led by Chairman DARRELL ISSA, has been respectful of self-government in the District of Columbia. Chairman Issa has not only observed the same self-government for our District that he insists upon for his, but he has gone beyond that to encourage greater home rule and budget autonomy for the District of Columbia. This subcommittee hearing is not done under the aegis of the full committee but, rather, under the leadership of the subcommittee chair, JOHN MICA.

The respect for local control lies at the heart of the formation of the United States of America, itself. It was the denial of that respect that led to the Revolution and to formation of the United States. Essentially, at that time, when Americans were saying taxes are a matter for local jurisdictions, it meant the United States, and when the Constitution, itself, was drawn, the Framers were at pains to separate out local matters over which the Federal Government would have no say and no control.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the House, of course, as well as the Senate, maintain some control over the District of Columbia that Congress does not have over other jurisdictions. I assert what should be clear in that illegitimate control, but at the very least, I respect and thank Members who have not gone out of their way not to violate their own principles of local government in order to exercise that control, as the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, under Chairman ISSA, has been clear to avoid. In short, don't have hearings on the District of Columbia—that's for the District of Columbia City Council.

The Government Operations Subcommittee has called for a hearing on Wednesday on the recently decriminalized marijuana law in the District of Columbia. It is important to note that there are Federal and State matters that are implicated in this hearing. The subcommittee has held two hearings on those implications because of the conflict between State and local law that is emerging very rapidly on

marijuana possession—but look at what the subcommittee did in its two prior committee hearings:

In one hearing, it called a U.S. attorney, who is a Federal official. It was a U.S. attorney from a district in Colorado and in addition, an official from the Drug Enforcement Administration. In another hearing, it called only one witness, the Deputy Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy. Do note that each and every one of these officials was legitimately called as a Federal official.

Why was no official from the State of Colorado called? There was no State official, no local official—only a Federal official from the State of Colorado. The reason is clear: Colorado would have taken umbrage at the audacity of this body to dare call them to account on their own local laws.

Be on notice that we take the same umbrage. We will not silently allow this Congress or its committees and subcommittees to interfere in our local affairs, and on this matter, we are standing on very solid ground.

Eighteen States went quite ahead of the District and decriminalized their marijuana laws. “Decriminalization” means that a fine rather than prison results from the possession of marijuana. Twenty States proceeded to enact medical marijuana laws, which to enable people who have certain medical conditions to get medical marijuana. It took me 11 years to remove—or to get the Congress to remove—an amendment that kept the District from allowing its own citizens to have access to medical marijuana at a time when we had a runaway HIV-AIDS problem, where medical marijuana had been helpful. I was finally able to do that. Two States of the Union—Washington and Colorado—have legalized marijuana.

How dare any committee or subcommittee call the District of Columbia local officials—any local official—to testify on our local law? I will get to why we enacted that law in one moment.

Let me say who preceded us and who has not been called before this House or any committee or subcommittee of this House even though they have done either precisely the same thing or have gone even further than D.C. I am going to call the roll, Mr. Speaker, so you will know the company in which we find ourselves and why we insist upon treatment without discrimination, because we are the exact equivalent of other American citizens:

Alaska: going back more than almost 40 years now—decriminalized marijuana. No penalty for use in one’s home. Actually, that is further than decriminalization. That legalized marijuana in one’s home;

California: a \$100 fine. Some of these are quite old, these laws. More recently, there has come a flood of marijuana laws changes.

Colorado: no penalty. Of course, there are different amounts involved,

and most of these involve people over 21;

Connecticut: a \$150 fine;

Maine: as low as a \$350 fine, as high as a \$1,000 fine depending on the amount;

□ 1300

Maryland, \$100 fine; Massachusetts, \$100 fine; Minnesota, \$300 fine; Mississippi, \$100 to \$250 fine; Nebraska, \$300 fine. That goes back to 1978, by the way. Nevada, \$600 fine; New York, \$100 fine; North Carolina, up to \$200 fine; Ohio, \$150 fine; Oregon, \$650 fine; Rhode Island, \$150 fine; Vermont, up to \$200 in fines; and the State of Washington, no penalty for those 21 or older.

What has the District of Columbia done? Its decriminalization involves a \$25 fine instead of a criminal misdemeanor, penalty of up to 6 months in jail, and as much as a \$1,000 fine. It also prohibits law enforcement from using the smell of marijuana as grounds for stopping and searching a resident.

The reason for the low fine is that the District faced the possibility—in fact, very real possibility—that if it didn’t have a low fine, it would end up with another disparity, namely, those who could afford the fine would not go to jail, and those who could not would.

I want to say something about why going to jail becomes so important. First, let me quote the President, who said:

Middle class kids don’t get locked up for smoking pot and poor kids do. And African American kids and Latino kids are more likely to be poor and less likely to have resources and the support to avoid unduly harsh penalties.

What the President said in general should be understood in particular in the District of Columbia, and I suspect in many States as well because the problem of disparity in enforcement is nationwide.

The District of Columbia is a very progressive jurisdiction, and it is very racially sensitive. We have a population that is about half Black and half White, about 10 percent Latino, very progressive. And yet, in the progressive District of Columbia, African Americans are eight times more likely to be arrested for marijuana possession than Whites.

Understand that, in the District of Columbia as across the country, Blacks and Whites use marijuana at the same rate. Why then are African Americans eight times more likely to be arrested? I can only guess. Sometimes they live in high-crime areas where there may be more police out on the street.

Notice that the legislation bars arresting someone because an officer smells marijuana on the person. Of course, if that is the reason for an arrest, what you can do is take somebody in who has violated no law except possession of a small amount of marijuana—and all of the amounts we are talking about are small amounts—and what happens is that that an African

American or White person or any other resident has a criminal record for the rest of his or her life. For an African American, that matters.

We have a whole generation particularly of young men who, with that first arrest, are essentially ruled out of the job market because they have a “drug possession arrest.” That drug possession is a small amount of marijuana. That ruins that young man’s life not only for work, but as the world turns, for the opportunity to have a good marriage, to raise children, and for African Americans to have a stable community, all beginning with one marijuana possession arrest.

The result may be to lead this person, frankly, into a life of criminal activity. You can’t get work because you have a drug possession arrest on your record. And if you can’t get work and you need money, what can you do? What you often do is you go from possessing marijuana, as many young people do, to the next level, to distributing it or otherwise being involved in criminal activity.

We don’t have to go this way.

I suspect that some of the jurisdictions that have decriminalized marijuana have done so—and you will notice they are very diverse—simply because they are more libertarian, a bit more open to what they see around them, which is that people engage in alcohol consumption as much as they do, in smoking marijuana, at least as much. We learned the hard way that you don’t put people in jail when it comes to drinking alcohol or even distributing it.

I want to be clear. I do not and will never advocate the smoking of pot, don’t think it is a good thing, don’t think being high is fine. I also don’t think drinking alcohol is a good thing, but I wouldn’t want to put anybody in jail for it. If someone is unfortunate enough to develop a habit, I want to do what we do with people who develop that habit with alcohol and try to get them off that habit.

Look. It is a free society. We cannot keep everybody from every sin, but we don’t lock them up in the jails. That is why you find State after State opening their jails and letting out people who have been convicted of drug possession, don’t want to ruin lives, particularly what amounts to young lives.

We feel very deeply about this. If I may say so, I think every jurisdiction that has passed these laws feels deeply about it and would tell Congress which way to go if Congress came anywhere close to their local laws. I am not going to tell Congress which way to go. I am just going to tell Congress: Don’t mess with our marijuana laws. And the reason I have to say that to the Congress is because Congress can.

This hearing could be the first step toward overturning D.C.’s marijuana law. Usually when they try to overturn one of our laws, they don’t give us a hearing. They just try to do it in some sneaky way.



This hearing is for show. But it is a dangerous hearing because it is about a real law and real people and real racial disparity and, yes, real discrimination against my district because we have been pulled out as no other jurisdiction has been.

I want to compliment those Members on the floor from the other side who were consistent with their own principles yesterday. There was a marijuana amendment on the floor yesterday, and the full details of it I don't have before me, but I recall it would allow prescription by Veterans Administration physicians for medical marijuana for certain wounded veterans because of the finding that it has a beneficial effect on some of their concerns, especially nausea and other kinds of conditions they bring back with them.

The vote was divided, but I looked at the members of the subcommittee who will be hearing on Wednesday about cannibus laws in the District of Columbia. There are seven members of that subcommittee; and two Republicans on that subcommittee, that seven-Member subcommittee, voted to respect states' rights and voted, in effect, to allow States to do what is necessary when it came to medical marijuana for veterans.

Yes, the parties are coming together on this issue, and for that reason it makes no sense whatsoever to have a divisive hearing that calls out one local jurisdiction—the weakest in the country because the District of Columbia has no Senators, because while I vote in committee, whatever you do to my District or even for my District, I cannot vote on it on this floor.

I can tell you this. As a result of this hearing and because the D.C. decriminalization bill has to lay over here for 60 days before it becomes final, it is still here, I have alerted my allies throughout the country, and particularly in those States which have decriminalized marijuana or legalized it. So if any Member of this House ever gets oversight over this matter and dares to vote that the District can't decriminalize cannibus, even though their citizens have the opposite right, we will call them out.

I don't believe that kind of hypocrisy exists in this House, nor do I know whether there is any attempt to try to overturn our laws. I have to come to the floor proactively, my friends, because Members don't exactly come to me ahead of time and tell me when they want to perform the illegitimate act of overturning a local law in the District of Columbia. So I am calling them out right now: Don't you dare to seek to countermand the elected, the democratically elected D.C. council which has decided what is best for its citizens, particularly if your own jurisdiction—and I have called your names—has decided that some form of marijuana possession decriminalization or legalization should occur in yours.

Even for those of you who come from parts of the United States which have

not changed their marijuana laws, let me say to you: I respect that your local jurisdictions, your State jurisdiction has not acted in that way. There are real issues here. We don't want people smoking marijuana to end up where people who smoke cigarettes did.

A lot of what is being done now, the city is already holding hearings on the law's effects, is putting in place measures that would have the effect of not only alerting people to the problems of smoking anything, but keeping this matter from being excessive. Smoking pot perhaps has more of a chance of being excessive at least among young people if it is barred. I am not so sure now that it is allowed in so many States, a third of the States, that you will have nearly the excitement about smoking pot as you did before it was decriminalized.

Whatever is the result is not for a national legislature, not in America where local matters get decided by local folks. Yes, there is a conflict with Federal law. That is for the Federal Government in its implementation of drug laws to take care of.

□ 1315

And if you want to somehow go out against these States which are rapidly decriminalizing marijuana laws—you have got to come after all of them, not just one—that is what I am here to say. We don't intend to be the outlier that Congress uses to prove its point about marijuana.

We demand respect for the principles for which the Constitution stands. Nothing in the Constitution says anything about respecting local control, except for the District of Columbia. The Framers left some control of D.C. matters with Congress, but certainly not the kind of control that would be exercised here. The Congress on its own decided that even the control that the Framers left in the Congress, it would never exercise, when it passed 40 years ago the Home Rule Act of the District of Columbia.

The Home Rule Act says that matters of local law are for the local jurisdiction of the District of Columbia, just as they are for the local jurisdiction of each of the 50 States. That was a landmark law. We intend that it will be respected. No hearing called, however illegitimate as this hearing is, is enough to override that law and its intent.

That law needs to be expanded, not sat upon with a hearing that picks out one local law. It needs to be expanded so that the 100 percent of local funds raised in the District of Columbia don't have to come before a national body before we can spend our own money, as if you were the masters of our local funds—almost \$4 billion of it raised from local citizens and local businesses.

You want to bring us before you on Federal funds? Be my guest. But don't come to the District of Columbia when it comes to its own money. And don't

come to the District of Columbia when it comes to its own laws.

Nobody in this House can speak with any credibility to the reasons, and they are legion, but don't forget the most important reason that the District decided to decriminalize its laws. It didn't even legalize marijuana, as two States have done; it decriminalized them.

It is a modest step, it is a responsible step. And it is a step taken in the face of horrific evidence, shameful evidence, that showed that, essentially, the only people that got arrested in the District of Columbia for marijuana possession are Black people. That is an outrage. The council had to do something about it. Just as the other States, for whatever reasons, have decided to move for local reasons, our council has moved for entirely local reasons.

We ask you to respect that move, especially when it comes to what I am sure will be countless lives of African American citizens in the District of Columbia that will now have a chance, at least, to escape from penalties of law enforcement, to live a fruitful life because they will not start off in life with marijuana possession penalties that ruin their entire lives.

We ask for equality of treatment. We are equal citizens under the law. If your citizens were treated unequally, each and every Member of this House would be on this floor. I come in that spirit, and I come asking for the very same respect.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### SUDAN TRAGEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 20th anniversary of the Rwandan genocide in which nearly a million perished in a horrific 100-day span while the world idly stood by.

As has been documented in print and film, including Samantha Powers' riveting book, "A Problem From Hell: American and the Age of Genocide," cables were sent, reports of the violence and the targeting of innocents received, and yet the American foreign policy apparatus was largely consumed not with stemming the bloodshed, but rather with avoiding use of the word "genocide" less it necessitate a response. And so many people died.

Of course, there is the now notorious negligence of the United Nations in this regard, which culminated in a catastrophic moral failure on the part of the international community.

Kofi Annan, then head of U.N. peacekeeping, was receiving on-the-ground intelligence from General Dallaire, who was a Canadian general, about the impending tragedy, and yet he repeatedly refused to authorize General Dallaire to seize known weapons caches



until it was too late. What horrors might have been prevented had Annan chosen otherwise?

Fast-forward several years.

President Clinton traveled to the Kigali Airport in Rwanda and issued what has come to be known as the "Clinton apology" for failing to do more to stop the violence.

Later, President George W. Bush famously wrote "not on my watch" in the margin of a report on the Rwandan genocide.

No President, Republican or Democrat, wants atrocities to occur on their watch. I venture this much is true of President Obama. And yet every indication points to the fact that the crisis currently unfolding in South Sudan is headed the way of Rwanda.

In fact, yesterday, the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, Navi Pillay, characterized South Sudan as "on the verge of catastrophe." But with the stakes as high as they are, the situation is simply not being met with the urgency it demands.

It is time for bold action.

President Obama, who so far has failed on this issue, should immediately dispatch former Presidents George W. Bush, who has a great reputation in Africa, and former President Bill Clinton, who also has a good reputation in Africa, to the region to help negotiate a lasting peace and to convey in no uncertain terms that the fate of South Sudan is a U.S. foreign policy priority.

Both of these men, President Bush and President Clinton, have done a great deal on this issue and have remained invested in Africa beyond their Presidencies.

This pair of statesmen, hailing from two different political parties, would send a powerful message to the warring factions, and especially as it relates to President Kiir, with whom President Bush and his team forged a lasting relationship during intensive negotiations involved with the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, and would open immediate lines of communication at a pivotal time.

I first visited Sudan in 1989, years before Darfur became a household word, and I have prayed for the day when the people of that long-suffering land would enjoy peace and representative government. I have been five subsequent times, most recently in 2012.

For more than two decades, a steady stream of Sudanese activists, Lost Boys and Girls who resettled in the United States, humanitarian groups operating in the region, and others have visited my office.

Whether it was the seemingly intractable war between the North and the South, the genocide in Darfur, or, in recent years, the violence in the Nuba Mountains set against the backdrop of the birth of a new nation, I have followed events closely in that part of the world, urging U.S. administrations of every stripe to engage vigorously in pursuit of lasting peace, justice, and rule of law.

I asked President Bush to appoint a special envoy. He appointed former Senator John Danforth, who did an incredible job with then-Secretary of State Powell.

While I did not support Obama's candidacy, I was heartened and encouraged by his rhetoric on Sudan during the 2008 campaign. I took further encouragement from some of the individuals who joined his foreign policy team—senior advisers with strong human rights credentials and a stated desire to see the United States lead in the prevention of crimes against humanity and other atrocities.

Sadly, those words have not translated into action.

As I noted earlier, Samantha Power, who rose to prominence for her reporting on genocide prevention, now represents the U.S. at the United Nations in New York. I wish her voice was stronger within this administration on this issue. I urge everyone to read her book. It was a profound book. I urge her to take the message of the book and be a spokesman in this administration.

Today, I stand before you as concerned as I ever have been about the state of affairs in South Sudan and the potential for the recent violence to spiral into genocide—a genocide that could defy even the horrors of Rwanda, given that oil reserves are in play.

On Monday, I received deeply troubling reports from individuals on the ground about recent atrocities in South Sudan and the lack of an effective U.S. or international response. I heard of civilians, including women and children, indiscriminately targeted and killed. I learned of houses of worship turned from places of sanctuary to mass graves. I was told of ethnic divisions that now run so deep, it could take generations to heal.

These reports, coupled with a smattering of news stories from the last several months, belie what can only be characterized as an emergency situation in urgent need of high-level intervention.

Consider the following excerpts from media accounts.

Voice of America, April 21:

The United Nations Mission in South Sudan on Monday accused opposition forces in Bentiu of carrying out targeted killings, including of children, and inciting "vengeful sexual violence" against women after they captured the town last week from government troops . . . UNMISS also said that individuals associated with the opposition have been using an FM station in Bentiu to broadcast hate speech.

It sort of reminds you of exactly what took place in Rwanda.

Will we ever learn?

The Washington Post, April 22:

Gunmen in South Sudan who targeted civilians, including children and the elderly, left "piles and piles" of bodies, many of them in a mosque and a hospital, the United Nations' top official in the country said Tuesday.

CNN, April 23:

South Sudanese rebels seized a strategic oil town last week, separating terrified resi-

dents by ethnicity before killing hundreds . . . Residents sought shelter in churches, mosques, and hospitals when the rebels raided Bentiu town.

Fox News, April 3:

As rebel forces entered Bentiu last week, residents were led to believe that by entering the mosque, they would be safe . . . But once inside they were robbed of money and mobile phones and a short while later gunmen began killing, both inside the mosque and inside the city hospital . . . If you were not Nuer, nothing could save you. The gunmen killed wantonly, including children and the elderly.

The Economist, April 26:

Even in a civil war that has been rife with atrocities, the scale of the massacre of civilians in South Sudan's oil hub of Bentiu on April 15-16 plumbed a new depth of hell. The rebel White Army, so-called after the ash its fighters sometimes smear on themselves, killed anyone they suspected of supporting the government, including—it is reported—200 people in a single mosque and others in churches and aid-agency compounds.

□ 1330

Local radio broadcasts helped to stir up ethnic hatred to direct the violence at perceived enemies of Riek Machar. No side is winning. Hopes of building a new country from scratch are drowning in blood.

I have a photo here—and many others—a graphic visual image of what you have just heard described. It is from the most recent massacre in Bentiu this month.

We see pictured the piles of bodies described in the news accounts, and just yesterday morning, I received reports from someone on the ground that another attack in that town could be imminent.

Where is the urgency from the Obama administration? Where is the outrage?

I read with great interest the recent statements by Kenya's president, in which he said: "During the 20th commemoration of the 1994 genocide in Rwanda"—the 20th anniversary is this month—"I expressed our region's disappointment at having done little to nothing at the time to end the slaughter of a million innocent victims, human beings in Rwanda, by a blood-thirsty cabal."

He went on—and I commend the president of Kenya for saying this: "I also pledged," he said, "in the name of Kenya and the region that we would never again allow a similar genocide to happen within our shores."

"I return," he said, "to the pledge today because of what is happening in parts of Sudan. We are outraged and gravely concerned at seeing the killings of hundreds of innocent civilians caught up in the internal conflict of the South Sudan Liberation Movement."

"We refuse," he said, "to be witnesses to such atrocities and to remain helpless and hopeless in their wake."

President Obama, Vice President BIDEN, this is happening on your watch. Will you allow it to continue? Will you to refuse to be a witness to the atrocities?

News coverage of these events have been sporadic, at best. While most

Americans are likely unaware of the horrors being perpetrated in South Sudan, people who are in a position to help know what is happening.

Yesterday, I had a press conference with Congressman PITTs and Congressman SMITH. Two members of the press—two members, only two members of the press even came. The room was empty. Nobody's covering this story hardly.

Will it be like Rwanda, when they all had all the stories, and you remember the movies that they did on Rwanda, looking back? Will the press then cover it, looking back? Will they then say whose fault it was that they didn't act?

Where is the media today? Where are the networks? Where is the Obama administration?

Cables are now being sent to Washington. Talking points are being drafted at the National Security Council and the State Department. These events are not happening in a vacuum.

Will we see the contents of the reports only after it is too late, when enterprising filmmakers and authors dredge up the documents and wonder why no one mustered the will to act?

A joint op-ed piece yesterday by long-term South Sudan expert Eric Reeves and John Prendergast, who has been on the scene, who has done so much to bring the attention to these issues, opened with the following line—they say: “No civilians in the world are in greater danger than those in South Sudan.”

Again, here is what they said: “No civilians in the world are in greater danger than those in South Sudan.”

You see how powerful—where they say even more than in Ukraine, more than in Syria?

The pair continue:

Unlike the asymmetric warfare to which we have been accustomed to hearing about in Iraq, in Afghanistan, and in Darfur, symmetric warfare ensures heavy casualties in military confrontations, but victories and defeats now have more ominous consequences; for in South Sudan, the victors see a military victory as justifying civilian slaughter of the predominant ethnic group of the opposing forces, and with a terrifying momentum, ethnic slaughter leads yet to greater ethnic slaughter.

In short, crimes have been committed by both sides. There are no angels in this conflict. There must be accountability for anyone implicated in these atrocities. We have the technology, the capacity, the eyewitness accounts to know who is involved and who is actively violating the ceasefire.

Reeves and Prendergast further warn of looming famine, given that the planting season has already been disrupted with more than a million forced out of their homes, and ominously, they predicted that as many as 7 million—7 million—could face starvation this fall.

The atrocities must stop. The suffering must cease. What is the end game?

America helped give birth to South Sudan. We have a moral obligation to

do something and something bold. So I say this: President Obama, you must not allow this to continue on your watch. I call on your predecessors, President Bush and President Clinton, to immediately engage in this crisis before more innocent blood is shed.

President Bush would go. President Clinton would go. Can you imagine the image of both President Bush and President Clinton there together?

So I close with this last thought: President Obama, Vice President BIDEN, failure to act—and this will be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for future generations to see—failure to act will be a stain on your administration and a blot on your conscience.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

#### THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN LEGAL AND ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 42 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that makes America great is that our country is a country that—regardless of one's race, one's religion, or one's ethnicity—we, as citizens of the United States, make up a collective family, the American family; yes, a diverse family, but a family, in and of itself, composed of all the people, the great variety of people we have here from every part of the world who have come here to live in freedom and enjoy the opportunity and the liberty and the justice that America represents.

Here, despite where one was born or whose one's parents are or when even one became a citizen, we are all equally part of that family.

Just as many families across our Nation have come to discover, at one point or another, in a time when there are scarce resources, when you are going through perhaps an economic crisis or trying to avert an economic crisis, it is not unreasonable to provide for one's family before helping others.

It is not selfish to watch out, thus, for our fellow Americans. It is not selfish to watch out for our fellow Americans above the well-being of foreigners, even foreigners who wish us well and, yes, foreigners who would like to become part of the American family; but, first and foremost, those Americans from every part of the world who are citizens of this country or, yes, who have come here legally in the attempt to become a U.S. citizen, their interest must be our first priority.

Tonight, I draw my attention and the attention of my colleagues to the dire consequences that we face if many—

and many people have been insisting that we do this—if we implement the so-called immigration reform which, of course, would legalize the status of those who are currently unlawfully living and working in our country.

Just as we are a nation of immigrants, we are also a nation of laws. What the American people and my colleagues must keep in mind, while debating this issue of immigration, is the distinction between legal immigration and illegal immigration.

Perhaps the thing that has disturbed me most in this debate is the attempt to blur the difference between the two, the difference, even to the point where statistics are being used to say: well, this is what immigrants have done for our society.

No, the statistics are what immigrants have done, but that does not include the illegal immigrants that are part of the equation.

No, illegal immigration is on a totally different plane. Legal immigration and illegal immigration are on totally different planes. Too often, we see these lines blurred, as I say, in this debate.

I happen to be very pro-legal immigration, and there is no reason for most Americans not to lift their head up when we actually understand that our country admits more legal immigrants annually than all the other countries of the world combined, totaling roughly a million legal immigrants every year.

While our immigration system certainly needs reforming or making it more effective and more efficient in what it is doing, this controlled and open process of legal immigration has worked well for America and demonstrates the capacity for our people to have compassion and generosity towards other human beings, other people who would like to come here to be part of the American family—coming here while obeying the rules, coming here not thumbing their nose at our legal system, coming here with respect towards the rest of us by obeying the laws and the regulations that are necessary for someone to come here legally.

Those folks have been wondrous, and, in fact, we all trace our roots back to people like this who came here and have contributed so much to the well-being of our country, and those million people who come here legally every year are a major positive asset to our country.

Despite our generous legal immigration policy, it is estimated that anywhere from 11 to 20 million foreigners are unlawfully present in the United States today.

While I certainly understand the positive motives and the essential goodness of the vast majority of these trespassers, of these people who are here illegally, it does not negate that they are lawbreakers, nor does it negate the economic and social consequences of inundating our country—

far above that million-person mark of legal immigration, but inundating our country with a large number of people, thus causing a growing damage to the American family, to people who are here who have come here legally, and to our U.S. citizens.

□ 1345

The dire consequences are evident to average Americans who see the decline in the quality of their schools, their neighborhoods—the safety of their neighborhoods, yes—and their health care. Yes, even their jobs. They can see the decline in the quality of the jobs that are available to working people in this country. Not only are citizens hurt by permitting illegals to cut in front of the line, but it is also a slap in the face to those who continue to wait their turn to come to America.

When we give in to trying to placate and trying to meet the interests of people who come here illegally, it is done at the expense of those people who are waiting in line and want to be American citizens and want to obey our laws and want to come here legally. Yes, illegal immigrants hurt the American people and hurt legal immigrants even worse.

Earlier this year, President Obama's 2012 unilateral deferral of deportation for certain illegal immigrants, essentially an amnesty decree, caused huge delays for thousands—that is thousands who are here legally seeking green cards, seeking to have government employees do their job and to actually make the immigration system work. Our government employees were servicing illegal immigrants at the expense of legal immigrants. They got it totally backwards. And that is the argument that we face today. It has a lot of things totally backwards.

While it is concerning that the President's actions appear to be political—which is this effort that we saw to try to appeal to the various segments of our population in order to conduct policy in the interest of illegal immigrants—I am most troubled by the fact that, basically, our President would defy the rule of law and congressional intent by unilaterally granting preferential treatment to those immigrants who are here illegally. And our President then, without congressional intent or any rule of law behind it, actually shifted the services of our government to service the needs of people who are here illegally at the expense of those people who are here legally.

Nearly 4.5 million mostly legal immigrants are currently caught up in the backlog of our bureaucratic immigration process. That is 4.5 million people who we need to be concerned about. They are part of the American family. They have come here as part of those 1 million legal immigrants that we have coming in, but yet they end up waiting decades—years, and sometimes decades—to make sure that their papers are processed so that they can become citizens.

The last thing we need to do—and unfortunately this administration has been doing it—is shift over the work effort and the time and the resources that are necessary to help these people who come here legally become citizens, shift that over to trying to service those people who are here illegally and have thumbled their nose at our law.

A policy which hurts those who follow the law and hurts those who are U.S. citizens and then rewards illegal and dishonest behavior is going to have some pretty bad consequences.

We are not fooled by the rhetoric—and no one should be fooled by the rhetoric—that we need to have “comprehensive immigration reform” and that it will in some way impact in a positive way what I have been talking about this afternoon. What they really mean when they talk about “comprehensive immigration reform”—what they really mean—is “amnesty.” They don't want to use that word because the American people learned what that was all about. What they are really doing is rewarding those who have broken the law; and they do so at the expense of American citizens and, yes, at the expense of those immigrants who are here legally.

As the saying goes: Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. Mr. Speaker, we have already been fooled once. Amnesty has been tested, and it has proven to be a failed policy. In fact, it has served only as a catalyst for chain migration, which has compounded many of the horrific economic and social challenges that we face today.

So we have already had an amnesty in the past, and we know what it has done to the challenges that we had then. It has made them worse. And now we have ended up with, as I say, horrific economic and social challenges.

I am, of course, speaking—when I talk about the amnesty of the past—of the 1986 immigration reform bill, where Congress infamously promised President Reagan that they would enhance border security in exchange for an amnesty on the behalf of nearly 3 million illegal immigrants then residing in the United States.

Needless to say, border security was never enhanced and, needless to say, many more than the 3 million that we were supposedly talking about were legalized through chain migration. And millions upon millions more would continue to illegally flock to our country.

Why?

Because they saw that those people who had come here illegally ended up becoming naturalized, ended up being put in front of the line of those people who were waiting diligently in other countries to come here legally. Thus, it created a major increase in the flood of illegals into our country.

As common sense would dictate, the U.S. Government cannot continue to send this type of mixed message, the message which basically says we are

going to reward that person who is here illegally by making him a citizen, putting him through the process actually even before those people who have come here legally, and anybody who gets here illegally, we will reward them with citizenship. They will then have the rights of Americans for education, for health care and the opportunities that are abundant here for American citizens and legal immigrants.

Well, if we continue to say anybody who can get to this country illegally or not is going to have those benefits, that is a mixed message if we expect that illegal immigration is going to be halted or in some way that the people overseas who are considering will hesitate to come here. In fact, we are rewarding those who made it here. Without expecting the legal immigration invasion of our country to increase, we actually gave people the incentive to come here illegally.

Illegal immigration only dramatically jumped after the 1986 amnesty deal, setting the path for our current predicament.

And what is our current predicament?

We have social and economic dislocation that is harming the American people, especially middle class working people. Like after the 1986 amnesty deal, those admitted into the United States under a new amnesty will surely have spouses, children, parents, even siblings back in their home country with whom they will want to reunite. They will insist on reuniting with—legally or illegally—those people who are in the United States.

So that is why we have ended up in a situation where we hear people say: Well, we have these people that we will never see in our family in this other country. Well, the people who are saying that have every right to go to that other country. It is as if someone who is in the United States who is saying that we have to reunite the families—and they are here illegally in the first place—that that is a reason that we should legalize their status so that they can reunite the family that has been left behind. No. The other option is people who are here illegally should go home and be with their families that they left behind. It is better for them to do that.

So this has really been a potential threat when we talk about family reunification and the rest because there is a potential to triple the number of people who are currently here in this country illegally. Let's get that right—triple. If we give amnesty and we legalize the status of those who are here illegally, we could be tripling the number of people. We could be inserting this number of people into our system.

If true, this abrupt population swell will fundamentally change America socially, economically, and, yes, politically, causing major consequences that we can even see across the board. And you can see what those consequences

will be because those people that now are swirling in the ranks of our population will mainly be poorer people, people at the poorest end of the economic level. We will be importing millions—tens of millions—of poor people, increasing poverty in America.

The stress that would place on our social services is one thing, but to our economy and what that does to the American people in the job market would be horrendous. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, every 1 percent increase in the labor force attributable to immigration tends to lower the relative wages of all American workers. Let's get that straight. That is what happens when you have an increase in the labor force by immigrants who come to this country. That is why we want to limit it to 1 million people.

If we have 11, 20, 30, 40 million people coming in, we can expect major decreases in the actual wages that all Americans receive. It is going to impact the American wages. Surprise, surprise. When you have a flood of illegal immigrants into a country, they are bending down the wages, bending down the wages of the American people.

However, those who stand to lose the most are whom, when we say that these people are mainly people from lower income levels? So what we are talking about, the people who are really losing by legalizing the status of illegals, by having a plan that would eventually bring tens of millions of more people into our country and insert them into our process, the people who are hurt the most are low-income, low-skilled American workers.

One major study found that increases in immigration during the 1980–2000 era resulted in an 8 percent decrease in wages for high school dropouts and a 3 percent decrease in wages for the average American worker. Well, this is hardly surprising. Well, for me, it wouldn't be surprising.

During my college days, I was a janitor. I worked as a janitor. And let's note, I worked as a janitor because I needed a job. I was cleaning toilets. I was scrubbing floors. I was picking up trash. That was not my desired job, but I needed the money.

Historically—right now—jobs such as these would be a steppingstone for those who perhaps lacked an education or were trying to earn their way through school. I was trying to help pay my education expenses. But after decades of illegal immigrants who have been bending back the wages and the businesses willing to exploit them, many of the jobs that we are talking about, like janitorial jobs, no longer pay even the wages that were paid in real dollars then.

□ 1400

I have gone back and taken a look at what a janitor makes, and janitors were making basically the same pay as I made back 40 and 50 years ago. Well,

why is that? Our economy has quadrupled, maybe tripled, in the last 40 years. How come janitors make exactly the same amount of money?

They have been left out. They have been left out because the job of janitor has been bid down. The wages for people who would be janitors in our country have been bid down, bid down by people who flooded into our country illegally willing to work for a pittance, willing to live in homes where you have three or four families to a house that is only supposed to have one family.

We have a situation where who is being hurt? It is that American who would have had that job being that janitor—maybe working his way through school, maybe not—who now can't take that job because it pays so little. People say, well, how can we afford to take care of buildings if you are going to have to pay a certain amount of money, more money to those people who are taking care of the buildings?

Well, proportionately it is the same. The people who own the buildings are making a bigger profit now at the expense of the fact they are paying a pittance to illegals to take care of the building.

But also we can rest assured that technology would by now have developed that would make the life of a janitor and the job of a janitor much more efficient. You probably would have toilet bowl machines that would permit one person to clean 100 toilet bowls a night rather than 12 or 15, and that, then, would mean that the person running that machine and making that machine would be an American citizen or a legal immigrant who is earning a decent wage.

There is nothing wrong with having people who are working those jobs earn a decent wage so that they could then raise a family and, yes, maybe own their own little home some day. That is the way it used to be. When you are a working person, then you can expect to earn enough to maintain a decent standard of living. But we have a flood of illegals coming in. Especially after we gave that amnesty, what we have done is bid down the wages of the American people as tens of millions of illegals are now present in our society.

To this point, between 1960 and 2012, a time when America was experiencing its highest levels of immigration, native-born workers and legal immigrants lost an average of \$402 billion in wages while native-owned firms, meaning American-owned companies, profited by an average of \$437 billion.

So thus we have wages being depressed by illegal immigration that actually lowered the amount of money by \$400 billion in money that was paid in wages, yet the people running the business or owned the property were \$437 billion richer. So what we have seen here is a huge shift of wealth to whom? To upper-class owners of businesses at the expense of the lowest level of Americans.

Now, how is our country a safe country? Our country is a safe country because all of us who are part of the American family are doing our part to protect our country. Those people at the lower end of the economic sphere, they are the ones who join the military and go out and defend us. They are the ones who obey the law. They are the ones whom we rely upon in their good judgment to support the Constitution and a rule of law. If they lose faith in the system, we will suffer greatly.

That is one of the things that is happening is that the poor people are being left out. Actually, their standard of living is going down. Of course, our friends in the other party have provided very lucrative welfare abilities to people to be on the dole rather than giving them a good job. At the same time, they are pushing for more government programs to give the dole, to make people dependent and thus, I might say, lose their dignity of being able to be self-sufficient. At the same time, the folks on the other side of the aisle are pushing for amnesty, for illegal immigration, that would bring in 40 million new people, insert 40 million people, foreigners, into our system.

What is that going to do for the poor people of this country? Why are the unions in our country not jumping up and supporting the rights of their working people not to be having to face illegal immigrant labor bidding down their labor? Over the last 50 years, there has been a massive transfer of wealth going on, and yet at the same time we see the business wages, business profits, going up and workers' wages going down. Yet we have policies that seem to encourage it that don't make any sense.

We have people who use the rhetoric of trying to care for America's poor. The last thing they should be doing is bringing in 40 million new foreigners—mostly poor—into our country.

Knowing this, it should be no surprise that Big Business has been a consistent advocate of amnesty. Big Business wants cheap labor, and this, I might add, is not being loyal to the American family. To be loyal to the American family, no matter who they are, whether they are poor Americans, working class Americans, we should be watching out for each other.

Lower wages, however, are not the only negative impact of mass illegal immigration into our country. Similar structural breakdowns and strains can be seen in our education system. People in the lower income parts of town are seeing their education system fall apart. We see the health care system in our country falling apart. We see as well in a variety of other institutions that people rely on that the strain of millions of illegals—and they want to bring more in—is destroying this social, this economic, and this infrastructure that our people depend on.

All things considered, if amnesty were being granted to the 11 to 20 million illegal immigrants currently in

the United States, it would cost the American taxpayers an additional \$6.3 trillion over the next 50 years. At least 45 million foreigners, mostly poor, would be inserted into our society.

Is that going to make America a better place? Are the working people, the people who are part of the American family, going to be better off because of that? Absolutely not. And the voices of the American people need to be heard because we have people posturing as if they are doing a favor for the less fortunate by advocating this amnesty for illegal immigrants which would bring in tens of millions of more poor people from foreign countries into our country.

With our national debt approaching \$18 trillion, a budget deficit of over half a trillion dollars and two unsustainable entitlement programs that we need in order to maintain some sort of security for the American people, Medicare and Social Security, these are currently on the road to bankruptcy, and if we bring in these millions more people, we can expect that the expenses of our government will shoot up trying to provide benefits for people who now—by the way, now after making them legal, they are entitled to those benefits.

Someone who is here legally is entitled to every benefit and protection as people who are here who were born here. And if we legalize the status of illegals, we are taking tens of millions of foreigners who are here illegally and granting them the rights to all those programs.

America cannot afford amnesty for those foreigners who are here illegally. We must take care of the needs of the American family, of American citizens, and of legal immigrants into our society who have joined our family. Their interests have to come first over the interests of—yes, and let me just say, there is no doubt that those people who are here illegally in our country, the vast, vast majority, 90 percent or more, are wonderful people.

We should not fool ourselves into thinking that we can somehow take care of all of the wonderful people in the world. We can't do it. As we try to do it and try to open up our borders even more than the 1 million legal immigrants that we have, we are going to attract even a bigger flood into our country which will put even more pressure on us. What we are doing in that case is hurting our fellow Americans.

Even if these people are wonderful people who come here legally and they are seeking opportunity, I am sorry, we can't take care of the whole world, and we can't tell the world that whatever good person comes here illegally we are eventually going to give them amnesty and they will be eligible for all our programs.

There is an argument about what are called the DREAMers, young people who were brought here by their parents. They didn't come here voluntarily. Their parents brought them here when they were 2 or 3. And now

they don't have legal status. There are a lot of obstacles in their way. They want those obstacles removed. They want themselves to be legalized. But do you know what will happen if we do that, if we say that a young person going to school because they are young and they have been brought here by their parents, what is going to happen? What will be the message if we do that?

If we legalize the status of just the DREAMers, we are telling the people throughout the world, man, when you come here illegally to the United States, make sure you bring your children. We are telling people throughout the world, bring your children to this country so we can take care of the needs of your children.

We have needs of our own children in the United States of America. And they are wonderful kids out there that we care about, but we have to care about our own kids first. People who have come here legally have that right. They are part of our family. American citizens are part of our family. But the well-being of children from foreigners in various countries throughout the world has to be second on our list, down on our list, way down as compared to the well-being of our own people.

Yes, if we take care of the DREAMers, what is going to happen is we will be encouraging a mass flow of young people into our country. Younger people who are in school, we will have to take care of their education, et cetera. That is not right. You can't give the incentive to people to come here and expect that we are not going to have many, many more people coming here. We will have many more DREAMers coming here if we legalize the status of those who have been brought here illegally by their parents.

This issue continues to be presented as a humanitarian imperative, as something that without cost we could help these people among us. We can do that without cost? There is nothing without cost. We are being presented that we can have an amnesty as if it is not going to cost the American people. It is costing us right now. What we have done in the last 20 years to ignore this influx of illegals into our country has already caused great damage to the well-being and the standard of living of American workers at the lowest level.

People say they think they are appealing to Mexican Americans by being for amnesty for illegals. The hardest-hit community in America, perhaps the hardest-hit, and certainly minority communities, including Mexican Americans, they know where their jobs are going. They know when they have a job and an illegal comes across the border from whatever country, Asia or Mexico or Honduras or Ireland or wherever they are coming from, if they are taking the job of an American, the Mexican American community is the hardest-hit. Their education funds are the hardest-hit. Their neighborhoods are the hardest-hit.

That is why I believe that Americans of Mexican descent are patriots. They are part of the American family. And that is why I do not believe that they want to legalize the status of every illegal that has poured into our country. It hurts their families more than anyone.

So what we need to do now is make sure that as we discuss legalizing the status of illegals, of amnesty—they don't want to call it that, they want to call it comprehensive immigration reform—that we keep in mind these things could have a dramatic, negative impact on the well-being of American people. Whose side are we on? That is what you have got to ask.

What are the answers to this? Let me just say that solutions are not easy, but I would suggest there is a simple but not easy solution. We should make sure that anyone who comes here illegally does not get a job. We need to E-Verify all the jobs that are here in the United States to make sure they are not going to illegals, and they should be going to Americans or legal immigrants. And we should make sure that no illegal immigrant or the immigrant's family receives government benefits, whether it is health care or education.

I don't believe in deportation, actually. I think deportation is the wrong tactic. But unless you are going to—the President, obviously, didn't fulfill his obligation for deportation, but he didn't take another step that would then deter illegal immigration. The step to do it is no deportation. It is dehumanizing. No sweeps through people's community. But don't give jobs and benefits that belong to the American people to foreigners who are here illegally. That is the solution.

They will go home. They will go home in peace. They have our well wishes. But they are not going to have our jobs and our scarce resources that should be going to the American people.

□ 1415

I would ask my colleagues, as this discussion on the legalizing of illegal immigrants takes place, that we be honest with each other, and yes, that we be compassionate, but that our compassion is aimed at the American people and legal immigrants and not just compassion for those who come here illegally.

No matter how wonderful people these people are, we have to consider the American people first.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### SECURITY THREATS TO THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if my dear friend from California

has seen this, but following up on his comments, this is part of the front page of the *Army Times*, April 28, and it says here:

Thousands more will be forced out; staff sergeants now on hit list.

It talks about the career killers, but because of the cuts to our military, we are forcing out thousands and thousands of patriots who wanted to make a career of the United States military. I, along with my friend from California, don't necessarily think it is a good idea to be saying: look, if you are illegally in the country, all you have to do is go displace yet another American patriot and take their job in the military, force them out into the civilian sector, where our United States military veterans have a much higher unemployment rate than the general population.

That is not a good idea. It is not fair to our patriots, and it should not be something that this Congress passes, to once again not only run out patriots who wanted to make the United States military a career, but force them out with illegal immigrants using their job, taking their jobs, forcing them into an unemployment sector, where their unemployment rates are so very high. They shouldn't be high.

People should be willing to hire veterans. They have phenomenal work ethics, or they wouldn't have been in the military, unless they got bumped out early for not working; but otherwise, from my 4 years in the Army, right after we turned to being a volunteer Army, it was a very difficult time. Our military was not appreciated.

I went through officer basic at Fort Riley, Kansas, and it was a standing order not to wear your uniform off post because of hatred for the military, and if you got caught by yourself in uniform, there might be a gang that would beat you up. It happened, so it was a standing order. You couldn't wear your uniform off post because of potential violence upon our military by American citizens.

It has blessed my heart to see America begin again to appreciate those who answer the call of their country, serve their country, and do so honorably and well in the United States military, which should result in our promises to our military and promises that, to some, helped induce them into the military of good health care, good veterans' care.

Now, I was only in 4 years and don't have a disability. I have never been provided any VA assistance or health care, but for those who need it, deserve it, were promised it, we can't be having a socialized medicine system that ends up being like most socialized medicine systems become; and the way ObamaCare will eventually lead this country into being, with regard to health care, you get put on lists.

Socialized medicine doesn't go broke because you get put on lists, and you die waiting for your procedure in sufficient numbers, at least we have people

die who won't get the procedure, or perhaps they need a hip or a knee, pacemaker, or whatever it is, they don't get them because they are having to wait in line.

We shouldn't do that to our Nation. We should repeal ObamaCare outright before it takes us there, but for the sake of this country, we can't continue betraying our veterans and not ensuring that they have the best health care that is available.

If VA clinics or hospitals aren't doing the trick, let's give them a card that lets them walk into any health care facility in the Nation and get the best care we have got, and let's keep our promise to them that we will take care of that.

My dear friend, Andrew C. McCarthy, has an article out in *National Review Online* today. He posted it at 4 a.m. I know Andy is up that time in the morning because, sometimes, we exchange emails at that time in the morning.

He is a brilliant lawyer, constitutional scholar, historian, and a patriot himself, who was the lead prosecutor in ensuring that the planner, the one most responsible for the first World Trade Center bombing in 1993, when President Bill Clinton was in office, he made sure he was convicted.

If one actually looks at comments by the brother of that al Qaeda leader, you find references to his brother saying: hey, you know, there is violence, there is going to be a lot more violence against the U.S., but I will be glad to help negotiate this thing if we can get release of The Blind Sheikh.

Morsi, who became president of Egypt, a Muslim brother, he made clear, before he was even elected, that he wanted to secure the release of The Blind Sheikh who plotted, planned, carried out the first bombing of the World Trade Center, which we can be thankful that it didn't result in more death and more damage.

We should have learned a lesson from that. We didn't learn it. We continued, under the Clinton administration, to treat that like it was some civilian crime, instead of what it actually was, an act of war. As an act of war, it should have stirred more of a response.

So perhaps there was someone in the White House after the World Trade Center was bombed in 1993, who wondered out loud within the White House: well, what difference at this point does it make why they bombed the World Trade Center or what we might have done to provide more security? What difference at this point does it make?

Because perhaps, if that kind of thinking were not in the White House during the 1990s, perhaps we could have looked more closely at the causes of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing and looked more closely at the forces behind it and determined, wow, this is really a group that is at war with the United States, radical Islamists have been at war with the United States since 1979.

We just didn't know it. There was a war going on, but it was one-sided because the other side, the United States, didn't know there was a war, so they weren't fighting a war. They just kept retreating.

In 1979, an act of war occurred in an attack against our embassy. The man, the Ayatollah Khomeini, radical Islamist who became the head of Iran, that President Jimmy Carter welcomed as a man of peace, that one of the top advisers right now in our Homeland Security Department spoke up for as a featured speaker at the Ayatollah Khomeini man of vision ceremony that was held some years back in this country.

Now, this featured speaker on behalf of the man of vision, the Ayatollah Khomeini, he is advising the Homeland Security Department; not only that, the FBI in 2011 gave him their highest civilian award. Some people do not understand there is still a war going on. Some in this administration and some in the Senate and some in the House may refuse to recognize it, but there is still a war going on.

Mr. McCarthy writes:

Here is the main point: The rioting at the American embassy in Cairo was not about the anti-Muslim video. As argued here repeatedly, the Obama administration's "Blame the Video" story was a fraudulent explanation for the September 11, 2012, rioting in Cairo every bit as much as it was a fraudulent explanation for the massacre in Benghazi several hours later.

Once you grasp this well-hidden fact, the Obama administration's dereliction of duty in connection with Benghazi become much easier to see, but let's begin with Jay Carney's performance in Wednesday's exchange with the White House press corps, a new low in insulting the intelligence of the American people.

Mr. Carney was grilled about just-released emails which corroborate what many of us have been arguing all along: "Blame the Video" was an Obama administration crafted lie, through and through. It was intended, in the stretch run of the 2012 campaign, to obscure the facts that (a) the President's foreign policy of empowering Islamic supremacists contributed directly and materially to the Benghazi massacre; (b) the President's reckless stationing of American government personnel in Benghazi and his shocking failure to provide sufficient protection for them were driven by a political-campaign imperative to portray the Obama Libya policy as a success—and, again, they invited the jihadist violence that killed our ambassador and three other Americans; and (c) far from being "decimated," as the President repeatedly claimed during the campaign (and continued to claim even after the September 11 violence in Egypt and Libya), al Qaeda and its allied jihadists remained a driving force of anti-American violence in Muslim countries—indeed, they had been strengthened by the President's pro-Islamist policies.

The explosive emails that have surfaced thanks to the perseverance of Judicial Watch make explicit what has long been obvious: Susan Rice, the President's confidant and ambassador to the U.N., was strategically chosen to peddle the administration's "Blame the Video" fairy tale to the American people in appearances on five different national television broadcasts the Sunday after the massacre. She was coached about what to say by other members of the President's inner circle. One of the emails refers



expressly to a “prep call” that Ambassador Rice had with several administration officials on late Saturday afternoon right before her Sunday show appearances.

□ 1430

The tangled web of deception spun by the administration has previously included an effort to distance the White House (i.e., the President) from Rice’s mendacious TV performances. Thus, Carney was in the unenviable position Wednesday of trying to explain the “prep call” email, as well as other messages that illuminate the Obama White House’s deep involvement in coaching Rice. The emails manifest that Rice’s performances were campaign appearances, not the good-faith effort of a public official to inform the American people about an act of war against our country. Her instructions were “to underscore that these protests are rooted in an Internet video, and not a broader failure of policy,” and “to reinforce the President and administration’s strength and steadiness in dealing with difficult challenges.”

Carney risibly claimed that the “prep call” was “not about Benghazi.” Instead, according to him, it was “about the protests around the Muslim world.”

Two points must be made about this.

The first involves the administration’s blatant lying. Benghazi was the only reason Rice was on the Sunday shows. If the massacre had not happened, there would not have been an extraordinary administration offering of one top Obama official to five different television networks to address a calamity that had happened a few days before.

Moreover, as is well known to anyone who has ever been involved in government presentations to the media, to Congress, to courts, and other fact-finding bodies, the official who will be doing the presentation is put through a “murder board” process. This is a free-wheeling session in which the questions likely to be asked at the presentation are posed, and potential answers—especially to tough questions—are proposed, discussed, and massaged. The suggestion that Rice, less than 24 hours before being grilled by high-profile media figures, was being prepped on something totally separate and apart from the incident that was the sole reason for her appearance is so far-fetched it is amazing that Carney thought he could make it fly.

The second point brings us full circle to Egypt.

Why would Carney claim, with a straight face, that Rice was being prepped “about protests around the Muslim world?” Because other than Benghazi, the “protest around the Muslim world” that Americans know about is the rioting, not protest, the rioting at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo a few hours before the Benghazi siege. When Benghazi comes up, the administration—President Obama, Hillary Clinton, Susan Rice, Jay Carney, et al.—love to talk about the Cairo protests. Why? Because the media—and, thus, the public—have bought, hook, line, and sinker, the fraudulent claim that those “protests” were over the anti-Muslim video. Obama & Co. shrewdly

calculate that if you buy “Blame the Video” as the explanation for Cairo, it becomes much more plausible that you will accept the “Blame the Video” as the explanation for Benghazi; or, at the very least, you will give Obama officials the benefit of the doubt that they could truly have believed the video triggered Benghazi, despite a mountain of evidence to the contrary.

You see, the Benghazi fraud hinges on the success of the Cairo fraud. If you are hoodwinked by the latter, they have a much better chance of getting away with the former.

But the “Blame the Video” is every bit as much a deception when it comes to Cairo.

Thanks to President Obama’s policy of supporting the Muslim Brotherhood and other Islamic supremacists in Egypt, post-Mubarak Cairo became a very hospitable place for jihadists. That included al Qaeda leaders, such as Mohammed Zawahiri, brother of al Qaeda emir Ayman Zawahiri; and leaders of Gama’a al-Islamiyya, the Islamic group, the terrorist organization that was led by The Blind Sheikh, Omar Abdel-Rahman, the terrorist I convicted in 1995 for running the jihadist cell that bombed the World Trade Center and plotted to bomb other New York City landmarks.

In the weeks before September 11, 2012, these jihadists plotted to attack the U.S. Embassy in Cairo. In fact, The Blind Sheikh’s son threatened a 1979 Iran-style raid on the embassy. Americans would be taken hostage to ransom for The Blind Sheikh’s release from American prison, where he is serving a life sentence thanks to Andy McCarthy. Other jihadists threatened to burn the embassy to the ground, a threat that was reported in the Egyptian press the day before the September 11 “protests.”

The State Department knew there was going to be trouble at the embassy on September 11, the 11th anniversary of al Qaeda’s mass murder of nearly 3,000 Americans. It was well known that things could get very ugly. When they did, it would become very obvious to Americans that President Obama had not decimated al Qaeda as he was claiming on the campaign trail. Even worse, it would be painfully evident that his pro-Muslim Brotherhood policies had actually enhanced al Qaeda’s capacity to attack the United States in Egypt.

The State Department also knew about the obscure anti-Muslim video. Few Egyptians, if any, had seen or heard about it, but it had been denounced by the Grand Mufti in Cairo on September 9. Still, the stir it caused was minor, at best. As Tom Joscelyn has elaborated, the Cairo rioting was driven by the jihadists who were agitating for The Blind Sheikh’s release and who had been threatening for weeks to raid and torch our embassy. And indeed, they did storm it, replace the American flag with the jihadist black flag, and set fires around the embassy complex.

It is important here, Mr. Speaker, to note that the al Qaeda leader’s brother, Zawahiri’s brother, he was out there even after the attack on Benghazi’s consulate, basically saying: Hey, there could be more rioting, more trouble, unless you work with me, and let’s get The Blind Sheikh released and then we can avoid future violence. Amidst all that is what Andrew McCarthy is pointing out, claiming it was all about a video.

In his article, McCarthy says:

Nevertheless, before the rioting began but when they knew there was going to be trouble, State Department officials at the embassy began tweeting out condemnations of the video while ignoring the real sources of the threat: the resurgence of jihadists in Muslim Brotherhood-governed Egypt, the continuing demand for The Blind Sheikh’s release (which underscored the jihadists’ influence), and the very real danger that jihadists would attack the embassy (which demonstrated that al Qaeda was anything but “decimated”).

The transparent purpose of the State Department’s shrieking over the video was to create the illusion that any security problems at the embassy—violent rioting minimized as mere “protests”—were actually attributable to the anti-Muslim video, not to President Obama’s policies and patent failure to quell al Qaeda.

Because there was a kernel of truth to the video story, and because the American media had abdicated their responsibility to promote the predominant causes of anti-Americanism in Egypt, journalists and the public have uncritically accepted the notion—a false notion—that the video caused the Cairo rioting. That acceptance is key to the administration’s “Blame the Video” farce in connection with the lethal attack in Benghazi.

At about 10 p.m. Washington time on the night of September 11—after they knew our Ambassador to Libya had been murdered and while the siege of Benghazi still raged—Secretary of State Clinton and President Obama spoke on the telephone. Shortly afterwards, the State Department issued a statement from Secretary Hillary Clinton blaming the video for the atrocity in Benghazi. That was the beginning of the fraud’s Benghazi phase—the phase Susan Rice was prepped to peddle on nationwide television. But it wasn’t the beginning of the fraud.

Secretary Clinton’s minions at the State Department had started spinning the video fraud hours earlier in Egypt. The sooner Americans grasp that, the sooner they will comprehend the breathtaking depth of the President’s Benghazi coverup.

Today, our Oversight Committee was having a hearing to see a retired general on the verge of tears finally coming forward, who was with AFRICOM. He knew what was going on, he knew the truth, and he could not remain silent; and so he came forward and said: Yes, there was really much more we could have done.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that all of those who were part of the

AFRICOM intelligence community will find courage from the general coming forward—some I know that have left our intelligence service and gone on to good civilian jobs. He has broken the ice. They can come forward now. I hope, Mr. Speaker, they get the message. He has come forward, the ice is broken, you won't be the first should be the message.

All of the hostility—I mean, when I have an intelligence officer, former intelligence officer, tell me—when I ask, “Where have you been?”—“I have been scared.” I said, “You have never been scared of anything.”

“I have been scared since 9/12.”

All of those who have been forced to remain silent, I hope they will come forward.

A mom with a son in our country's service had told me after 9/12 about where her son was and what he was doing. So I called him, and it took a long time to get hold of him. He wasn't forthcoming. His mom told me yesterday, or this week, that he'll be out of the U.S. service before long and he wants to talk and come clean. I hope more will start coming clean on the strength of this retired general's courage.

But in the remaining minutes, it should not be lost that today is the National Day of Prayer. For some that still are not convinced at what is at war here, we simply need to look at a statement from Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind who is at Guantanamo. I am grateful to President Obama that he has kept him there. He is a threat to the world, and particularly the United States. He was the mastermind behind 9/11.

In the pleading he prepared himself on page 4—this has been declassified so anybody can find it on the Internet—he says:

We do not possess your military might, not your nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, we fight you with the almighty God. So, if our act of jihad and our fighting with you caused fear and terror, then many thanks to God, because it is him that has thrown fear into your hearts, which resulted in your infidelity, paganism, and your statement that God had a son and your trinity beliefs.

In other parts of the pleading he makes clear that Jews should be destroyed.

Here he makes clear, also, anyone who has a trinity belief believes that God had a son. Then he quotes from the Koran saying:

Soon shall we cast terror into the hearts of the unbelievers, for that they joined companies with Allah, for which he has sent no authority; their place will be the fire; and evil is the home of the wrongdoers.

So he bases his belief that anyone who believes in a holy trinity should go to the fire and burn forever on that part of the Koran. Others have different interpretations, but radical Islamists believe that.

That is why I think it is immensely helpful to go back to after the Declaration of Independence but before the Constitution.

In 1783, the Treaty of Paris was entered in Paris, France, between American diplomats and British diplomats. Britain was the strongest country in the world, and our American diplomats knew they had to come up with something that was so important that the strongest nation in the world would not quickly come back after the new United States.

□ 1445

When I first saw this document, I was shocked at the first words, and then it made sense. The beginning of the treaty that forced Great Britain to acknowledge United States' independence starts with these words: “in the name of the most holy and undivided Trinity.”

They believed in the Holy Trinity. They knew that Great Britain believed in the Holy Trinity. They wanted something under which the Brits would swear that would be so important that they would not dare break that oath. That is why it started, “in the name of the most holy and undivided Trinity.” That is where we got our start. That is why radical Islam is at war with us.

I hope and pray on this National Day of Prayer that we will humble ourselves, admit our wrongdoing, turn back to the God who has protected us—and He will bless our land.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for April 29 and 30.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 2, 2014, at noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5504. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act in the Office of International Affairs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5505. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a piece of proposed legislation to authorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States for the period of October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5506. A letter from the Acting Director, Directorate of Whistleblower Protection Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Handling Retaliation Complaints Under the Employee Protection Provision of the Con-

sumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 [Docket Number: OSHA-2011-0540] (RIN: 1218-AC58) received April 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5507. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Advisory Committee: Bone, Reproductive and Urologic Drugs Advisory Committee [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-0355] received April 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5508. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Spirulina Extract [Docket No.: FDA-2012-C-0900] received April 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5509. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule — NRC Assessment Program for a Medical Event or an Incident Occurring at a Medical Facility; Management Directive 8.10 [DT-14-07] received April 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5510. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the December 17, 2013 — February 14, 2014 reporting period including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq, pursuant to Public Law 107-243, section 4(a) (116 Stat. 1501); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5511. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of a proposed lease with the Government of United Arab Emirates (Transmittal No. 05-14) pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5512. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5513. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5514. A letter from the HR Specialist, Small Business Administration, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5515. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type certificate Previously Held By Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters)



[Docket No.: FAA-2013-0822; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-004-AD; Amendment 39-17783; AD 2014-05-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5516. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0789; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-127-AD; Amendment 39-17782; AD 2014-05-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5517. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0642; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-035-AD; Amendment 39-17777; AD 2014-05-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5518. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0835; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-095-AD; Amendment 39-17790; AD 2014-05-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5519. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0171; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-038-AD; Amendment 39-17812; AD 2014-06-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5520. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the final feasibility report and final supplemental environmental impact statement; (H. Doc. No. 113-105); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

5521. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination of Housing Costs Amounts Eligible for Exclusion or Deduction for 2014 [Notice 2014-29] received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5522. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting fourth quarterly report of FY 2013 on Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

5523. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting first quarterly report of FY 2014 on Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4539. A bill to require the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, when issuing a research paper, to include all stud-

ies, data, and other analyses on which the paper was based; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 4540. A bill to regulate certain deferred prosecution agreements and non-prosecution agreements in Federal criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4541. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to develop a strategy report to address the skills gap by providing recommendations to increase on-the-job training and apprenticeship opportunities, increase employer participation in education and workforce training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 4542. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend expensing of environmental remediation costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 4543. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to apply CMMI waiver authority to PACE programs in order to foster innovations in such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 4544. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow a deduction for any fine paid by an owner of professional sports franchise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 4545. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Pat Harrison Waterway District approximately 8,307 acres of National Forest System land within the Bienville National Forests in Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. COLE, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 4546. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 4547. A bill to modify the definition of "antique firearm"; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4548. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to include programs that teach technology literacy in any job training program for ex-offenders offered under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4549. A bill to require the Forest Service to meet annual volume targets for timber harvesting in the management of a unit of

the National Forest System and to provide for the transfer of such management responsibility to the State in which the unit is located when such targets are not consistently met, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4550. A bill to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, and to stimulate the economy and create opportunities for new job creation; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Education and the Workforce, Small Business, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 4551. A bill to amend the Forest Legacy Program of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 to authorize States to allow certain entities to acquire, hold, and manage conservation easements under the program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 4552. A bill to encourage and ensure the use of safe equestrian helmets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARR, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 4553. A bill to authorize appropriations for fossil energy research and development programs at the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MULVANEY (for himself and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 4554. A bill to amend the securities laws to improve private market offerings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL):

H.R. 4555. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and make permanent rules related to investment by non-resident aliens in domestic mutual funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 4556. A bill to help small businesses access capital and create jobs by reauthorizing the successful State Small Business Credit Initiative; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4557. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide for notice to, and input by, State insurance commissioners when requiring an insurance company to serve as a source of financial strength pursuant to such Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 4558. A bill to clarify the authority of States to regulate private flood insurance coverage; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mrs. NOEM):

H.R. 4559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the time period for contributing military death gratuities to Roth IRAs and Coverdell education savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 4560. A bill to allow members of the Armed Forces and National Guard to defer principal on Federal student loans for a certain period in connection with receipt of orders for mobilization for war or national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 4561. A bill to specify requirements for the next update of the current strategic plan for the Office of Rural Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs for improving access to, and the quality of, health care services for veterans in rural areas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 4562. A bill to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H. Res. 562. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to enhanced relations with the Republic of Moldova and support for Moldova's territorial integrity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H. Res. 563. A resolution expressing support for designation of May as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GALLEGU, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 564. A resolution expressing support for designation of May 2014 as "Health and Fitness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 4540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Section 8, clause 18: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; and

Article I; Section 8; Clause 3 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 4542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 4543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 4544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 4545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Section 3 of article IV of the Constitution

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Const. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 4547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the United States Constitution related to general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section III, Clause II

"The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 4551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, of section 8, of article I.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 4552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, as this legislation provides for the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 4553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution: the Congress shall have the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 4554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 4555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan:

H.R. 4556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 4559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 4560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 4561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 4562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 309: Mr. LATTI.

H.R. 498: Mr. VELA, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 543: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 596: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1020: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 1097: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 1125: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1239: Mr. MCALLISTER.

H.R. 1413: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1428: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1441: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1449: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1461: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 1462: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 1551: Mr. OLSON, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1563: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1652: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1717: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1733: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1750: Mr. FLORES, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DENT, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1779: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1798: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1812: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1830: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 1918: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2028: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2146: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2156: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 2203: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VELA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MESSER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. DAVIS of Cali-

fornia, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 2315: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 2415: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2417: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 2429: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 2548: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2708: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 2725: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 2807: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2870: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2932: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 2936: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2939: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 3135: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 3179: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 3283: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 3318: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HAHN, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 3338: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 3344: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 3367: Mr. LATTI, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 3382: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3383: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. DELAUNO.

H.R. 3408: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 3481: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. FLEMING, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 3490: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 3516: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3530: Ms. ESTY, Mr. STIVERS, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3581: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 3600: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 3610: Mr. COTTON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3616: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 3665: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3673: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3708: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 3722: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 3723: Mr. LATTI.

H.R. 3776: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 3850: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 3877: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 3921: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3930: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 3976: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3992: Mr. KLINE, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4016: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4031: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 4040: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 4058: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 4060: Mr. HANNA and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4092: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 4119: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4158: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 4162: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 4190: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 4221: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4225: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 4229: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 4250: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 4260: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 4285: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 4315: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 4316: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 4320: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 4321: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 4329: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 4342: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 4351: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 4365: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 4372: Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 4374: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 4383: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 4423: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 4433: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 4438: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 4447: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 4450: Mr. POCAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 4457: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 4471: Ms. MOORE and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 4485: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 4491: Mr. POSEY and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 4504: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 4510: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. DUFFY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 4528: Mr. ENYART.

H.J. Res. 5: Mr. LONG.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. GARAMENDI and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. GALLEGGO.

H. Res. 30: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.

H. Res. 72: Ms. EDWARDS.

H. Res. 190: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. VARGAS.

H. Res. 456: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. KIND.

H. Res. 525: Mr. HOLT and Mr. GRAYSON.

H. Res. 538: Mr. POSEY and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 540: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 542: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H. Res. 547: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. RAHALL.

H. Res. 561: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YODER, Mr. COOK, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.